UNITAS

Ecclesia "Clamat ad omnes ut revertantur et inserantur."—St. Augustine

INTERNATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW

Organ of the Unitas Association — English Language Edition

Vol. XI — SUMMER, 1959 — No. 2

JEROME CORNELIS, A. A.
The General Council: the Hope of Unity

KENNETH DOUGHERTY, S. A.
Marian Devotion among Anglo-Catholic Religious Communities

BERNARD LEEMING, S. J.
Principles of Catholic Ecumenism

PAUL LESKOVEC, S. J.
The Forthcoming Ecumenical Council as Seen by Three Russian Theologians

JOSEPH GILL, S. J.
Personalities of the Council of Florence, IV
Mark Eugenicus: Metropolitan of Ephesus

COMMENTS AND DOCUMENTS
Four Preparatory Documents of the Vatican Council
The Future of Faith and Order — the View of a World Council Official
A Hebrew Christian Correspondent States His Views on Missions to the Jews
Apropos of the Fourth Centenary of the Calvinist Confession of La Rochelle

ECUMENISM AND REUNION — AROUND THE WORLD

BOOK REVIEWS

PUBLISHED BY THE SOCIETY OF THE ATONEMENT, GRAYMOOR, GARRISON, N. Y.

Imprimatur:

Rome, July 7, 1959

† Aloysius Traglia
Archiep. Caesarien., Vicesgerens

ROME - PONTIFICAL GREGORIAN UNIVERSITY PRESS

THE GENERAL COUNCIL : THE HOPE OF UNITY

At the end of the impressive ceremony which took place in the Basilica of Saint Paul-without-the-walls on Sunday, 25th January, Pope John XXIII held a meeting with eighteen cardinals which took on something of the aspect of a secret Consistory. Shortly afterwards, the Vatican Press Service published the following communication :

« On the occasion of this morning's visit to the patriarchal basilica of S. Paul-without-the-Walls, after attending a service in the papal chapel, His Holiness John XXIII addressed an allocution to the cardinals who were present at the ceremony.

His Holiness spoke of several matters concerning the most pressing apostolic works which had been brought to his notice during the first three months of his pontificate; those which pertain to his responsibilities, both as Bishop of Rome and as supreme Pastor of the universal Church.

As Bishop of Rome, the Holy Father drew attention to the great spread of the city in recent years, and the consequent serious problems of ministering to the spiritual needs of the population.

As supreme Pastor of the Church, he mentioned the dangers which today are more and more threatening the spiritual life of the faithful, namely, errors which are creeping in here and there, and the excessive attraction of material possessions which now more than ever are being amassed, thanks to technical progress.

To meet these pressing problems, the Supreme Pontiff, inspired by the age-old customs of the Church, has announced three vitally important events. These are: a diocesan synod for Rome; the calling of an ecumenical council for the universal Church; and the modernisation of the Code of Canon Law, which will be preceded by the forth-coming promulgation of the Oriental Code.

As regards the ecumenical council, it is the intention of the Holy Father that the aim should be not only for the spiritual good of Christian people, but also to invite the separat-

ed communities to seek again that Unity for which so many souls are longing in these days throughout the whole earth ».

Thus the Church Unity Octave culminated in the solemn announcement of an ecumenical council. The week was celebrated at Rome, as throughout the world, in a spirit of fervent hope. May we not recognise in the Holy Father's decision a reply from God himself to the great wave of prayer which has resounded from all parts of Christendom? For it is the one Spirit which inspires the head of the Church, and which prompts the movement for reunion which is such an impressive feature of our times, both in its extent and in its quality. This decision is important in many ways. The Sovereign Pontiff desired that it should come as the echo of the priestly prayer of Jesus, as the natural conclusion of an octave which has now been observed for fifty years; as heaven's answer to the unanimous prayer of brothers in Christ who lament their divisions, yet trust in God's mercy. He, in His goodness, can miraculously overthrow the barriers which separate us.

What is an Ecumenical Council?

By its very nature, the ecumenical council is a call for union to separated Christians. It solemnly confronts them with that unity which already exists within the true Church. For an ecumenical council is the full assembly of all the bishops of the world in communion with Rome, holding the same faith, offering the same worship, obeying the same laws. Is not this deep unity of mind and heart a realisation of Christ's prayer, and an accomplishment of his will? These bishops, met under the authority of the Supreme Pontiff, debate and legislate together about those matters which are of importance for all Christendom. There is nothing surprising in the fact that some discord may arise during such arduous discussions. Each one is left completely free to give his opinion and to justify his point of view. And the two-thousand-year history of the councils shows that such interplay of ideas is often profitable for the Church. Under the light of the Holy Spirit, solutions and agreements are worked out little by little; and the primacy and the power of judging which Christ gave to St. Peter's successors always makes this unanimity a reality, necessary for the growth of the Mystical Body. So the history of the Church has shown how necessary is the Papacy, instituted by Christ. That the Pope should be at the head of the council is required by the nature of the Church; and this indicates to us the real way to Unity. Without this su-

preme authority, the Body of Christ would be incomplete. That is why, in his encyclical *Sempiternus Rex* of the 8th September 1951, published on the 15th centenary of the Fourth Ecumenical Council, Pope Pius XII exhorted our separated brothers of the East to imitate the example of the Fathers of Chalcedon, and to « render due homage to the Apostolic See, which serves while it presides: this rock of truth which God has set up unshakably ».

How many Ecumenical Councils have there been?

Our handbooks of Church history generally give us a list of twenty-one ecumenical councils, which are known by the names of the places where they were held. These great assemblies of the episcopate were relatively rare, for in twenty centuries there have been just over twenty of them. However, there is in fact no official list of the ecumenical councils recognised as such by the Church. Their doctrinal importance varies. The great councils of the early centuries defined the foundations of our faith. But several medieval councils met only to deal with disciplinary matters or problems peculiar to the West. For this reason Father Venance Grumel has suggested a division of councils into two categories. In a very stimulating essay he bases his distinction on the doctrinal importance of the councils. Those which took decisions concerning revealed truth would be called « ecumenical councils of the first rank », or more simply, « ecumenical councils »; the rest, which dealt with disciplinary or philosophical problems, would be called « ecumenical councils of the second rank », or more simply, « general councils » (1). It goes without saying that this distinction is of great interest from the point of view of union. Our Orthodox brothers, in fact, acknowledge only the first seven ecumenical councils, which alone they recognise as authentic organs of the infallible Church. They have never approved the decisions taken by councils after the schism, because they were taken in a state of separation. Moreover, many of these decisions have no interest whatever for them, because they were intended to resolve purely Western questions, either disciplinary or temporal. The decisions taken after the schism constitute in their eyes a series of additions to the doctrine of the first seven councils. Therefore, we have every reason for not enlarging their scope unnecessarily, and above all for not putting the second-rank councils on the same footing as the

(1) V. Grumel. « Suggestions for unity. The unity of the Churches and the number of the ecumenical councils », in the review *L'Unité de l'Eglise*, n. 58, Jan-Feb. 1933, pages 5-7.

first seven ecumenical councils. Does this, then, imply that since the unhappy separation of East and West there have been no more first-rank Councils? By no means. It would be a mistake to think that the Councils of Florence, Trent, and the Vatican do not fulfil the conditions of ecumenicity on account of their doctrinal importance.

The last four first-rank Councils.

From what has been said, we would reckon as fully ecumenical the first seven councils, and in addition those of Lyons, Florence, Trent, and the Vatican. The question is, could our Orthodox brothers with any readiness give their assent to the decisions taken by the last four fully ecumenical councils? Firstly, it should be noted that Orthodoxy has long desired the calling of an ecumenical council to face the new problems which are arising in Eastern Christianity in the realms of doctrine and discipline. This desire is repeatedly expressed in the declarations of the Patriarchs of Constantinople, especially since 1931. In 1952 the Patriarch Athenagoras proposed the calling of a pre-conciliar conference. So one may hope that Orthodoxy may receive His Holiness John XXIII's approach with favour. This pre-conciliar conference would seem to be a pan-orthodox council, in the course of which it would be decided that the basis of future discussions would be the doctrine of the seven first councils. From this starting-point, it remains to be seen whether the Orthodox episcopate, guided by the Holy Spirit, would find itself able to assent to the dogmatic definitions and decisions taken by the great councils after the schism. As for the four above-mentioned councils, our Orthodox brothers will readily admit that they are of great importance for Christendom as a whole, and that they are consequently to be studied sympathetically. And moreover, the presence of Greek fathers at Lyons and Florence made these councils assemblies of East and West, for the purpose of defining the doctrinal points which divide the Churches. In a new atmosphere, under the influence of the Holy Spirit and free from political pressure the Orthodox bishops would be able to give their assent to those revealed truths defined by their fathers in the faith at the Councils of Lyons and Florence. As for the Council of Trent, its object was to rebut the denials of the reformers, and to define the articles of faith which the Protestants contested. Now these dogmas form an integral part of the common heritage of the Churches of East and West. In assenting to the decisions of the Council of Trent, the Orthodox would merely recognise that which differentiates them from the Protestants.

The schism of the Reformation was a Western affair, and it was natural that the Latin Church should have taken the lead in re-establishing true doctrine. But nothing need now prevent the Orthodox from contributing their own particular angle in the course of the forthcoming council, while giving their assent to the decrees of Trent. This particular angle would be of great value to our Protestant brothers, who have already made much of the presence of the Orthodox in the World Council of Churches.

As to the Vatican Council, it should first of all be noted that the Council has not yet officially been closed, and that it left its work unfinished. In particular, there are points of doctrine concerning the episcopate and the internal constitution of the Church, which (except for the doctrinal rôle of the Pope) the Vatican Council did not have time to define. Now it is precisely in this sphere of the relationship between Pope and Episcopate that we find the major differences of ideas between Orthodoxy and Catholicism. Thus, the forthcoming council will be able to clear up many prejudices and wipe out misunderstandings, as indeed the encyclical *Mystici Corporis* has already done. It is in any case desirable that there should be unanimity in the Orient, as there is in the Occident, on such important matters as the constitution of the Church, her internal structure, and the visible authority which Christ desired as the head of his mystical Body.

The warfare against error.

By carrying out their appointed task the ecumenical councils promote unity. Indeed Christian unity can be created by the truth. Now the councils in the past have generally striven against error in every form. As has been mentioned, they were called at the moments of great crisis. To confront heresies, indiscipline and laxity, the bishops of the Christian world, united with the Supreme Pontiff, felt the need of meeting and acting together. The first seven ecumenical councils, whose value is recognised by our Orthodox brothers, combatted the great heresies in this way: Arianism, Macedonianism, Nestorianism, Monophysitism, Origenism, Monothelitism, and Iconoclasm. These errors threatened the traditional faith. Their condemnation was not a purely negative action. It re-established the truth and proclaimed the sure foundation of Christian doctrine. And history shows that it restored unity of heart and mind at the same time, a unity which had been menaced by the innovators and their disciples. This result shows that true unity can only be realised in a fully dogmatic Christianity.

Today other errors, no less grave than in the past, are imperilling the Church. These errors are harmful not only to the Catholic Church, but to Christendom as a whole and to the modern world. The Vatican communication reminds us of them explicitly. Materialism is gaining ground and threatening the spiritual life. Steps must be taken. But they must be taken not only by Catholics. A common front must be created against the enemies of God. That is why the announcement of the ecumenical council is accompanied by an invitation to union to all Christians. May our separated brothers give heed to this invitation.

The Growth of the Mystical Body.

Despite their exceptional character, the ecumenical councils are still outstanding manifestations of the life of the Church. Like every living organism, the Mystical Body finds it necessary to defend itself against everything which might threaten its existence or impede its right functioning. A council is one of the means of self-defence against heresy and back-sliding. But there is another law of life which impels an organism to grow and develop. Where the Church is concerned, we know that God alone gives the increase. Under the care of the Holy Spirit, then, the Pope has decided to summon the extraordinary assembly which brings together the episcopal body, so as to consider new steps to be taken for the extension of the Kingdom of God. Inspired from on high, His Holiness John XXIII has already fixed the theme of these discussions: the search for means of restoring Christian Unity. These means will not be such as our imaginations can conceive, but those which the Holy Spirit will show to the Fathers of the Council, who are our « Judges in the Faith ». Must we then remain passive in the face of such an important event in the life of the Church? This would be to misconceive the profound significance of the council, which must be an expression of the unity of Christian people. Our will, our concern for the cause of Christian Unity, must respond to the decisions of the episcopal body under the presidency of the Pope. This will and this concern will manifest themselves first of all in prayer, since unity is the gift of the Holy Spirit. Instead of giving our attention to learned forecasts or futile speculations as to what will or will not take place, we shall best serve the Church and the interests of the Kingdom of God by redoubling the fervour of our prayer and by trying to grow in the charity of Christ.

The living image of Unity.

Now there is one vital point: the ecumenical council is the living image of Unity, that Unity which Christ desires for his Church. The council is in itself the incarnation of this ideal, for which « so many souls are longing in these days throughout the whole earth ». So it is already a powerful instrument in the hands of the Church for the restoration of Unity. Of course, Catholics are united quite independently of the council, because they possess, by God's grace, unity of government, of faith, and of communion. Doubtless, even apart from the council, the Pope remains the infallible and watchful guardian of that unity, carrying out Christ's mandate to Peter and his successors. Meanwhile, the ecumenical council presents before the eyes of the world in an impressive fashion the splendour of this wonderful union of souls within Catholicism. The council is an epiphany, an apotheosis of Unity, because it expresses in an outstanding way the unanimity of the Christian body on those matters which appertain to the life of the Church. It facilitates the taking of decisions by the whole episcopal body. And as has been declared by the Constitution *De Fide Catholica* of the Vatican Council, « therein the bond between members and head is drawn closer; there the vigour of the whole mystical Body of Christ is increased ». The council is also the teaching Church's reply to Our Lord's invitation (Matthew XVIII, 19-20), « Again I say to you that if two of you shall consent upon earth concerning anything whatsoever they shall ask, it shall be done to them by my Father who is in heaven. For where there are two or three gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them ». It was in answer to this invitation that the Apostolic College met at Jerusalem under the direction of St. Peter, as we read in the book of Acts. And it is in answer to this same invitation that Pope John XXIII will call together the present successors of the Apostles, dispersed throughout the whole world.

Lessons from the past.

In an article in the weekly *Réforme,* M. Jean Bosc has pointed out that the coming council will be ecumenical, not only because it will represent « the static universality of one Church », but rather because it will have a « dynamic tonality » in its attempt to reconcile all Christians. It cannot be otherwise. The charity which will animate the members of the council can know no frontier, no exclusiveness. It has already found expression in the invitation to the separated communities, and whatever be the form which this

invitation eventually takes, we know that it will be an answer to the prayer, « that they may all be one, that the world may believe ». Other councils in the past have issued invitations which were sometimes badly received. Men's minds had not been prepared for the search for brotherly unity. Fleeting unions were concluded under the pressure of events or of political authority; and quite un-religious motives pushed through hasty reconciliations which came to nothing. The second Council of Lyons (1274) which fulfils the conditions of full ecumenicity was one of these past attempts. Pope Gregory X, who summoned this council, gave as the principal aim: union with the Greeks, the defence of the Holy Land, and the reform of morals. And George Pachymeres, an enthusiastic partisan of the schism, assures us nevertheless that the Pope's desire was sincere. « It was obvious », he writes, « that the Emperor (i. e. of the East, Michael Paleologus) wanted peace for fear of Charles of Anjou, and that otherwise he would never have thought of it; while Gregory wanted it for the betterment and the unity of the Churches ». As is well known, the Pope's aim was achieved, but the reunion concluded at Lyons was doomed to check-mate because of the Greek emperor's repressive measures and the requirements of the Holy See. At the end of a remarkable study of the Council of Lyons, Father Venance Grumel points out clearly the lesson to be learnt from this set-back: « Before proclaiming union, it has to be created by an intellectual and moral growing together of the two worlds. If the new cloak of union is sewn on to the old coat of schism, one gets the result stated in the Gospel: the two pieces cannot stay together, and the rent is made worse: *aufert supplementum novum a veteri, et major scissura fit* » (Mark II, 21) (2).

Concerning the Council of Florence, one cannot say that it was totally doomed to check-mate. Following upon the assemblies of Basle and Ferrara, this council managed to create unanimity on doctrine, and substantial agreements were achieved on the points at issue between Greeks and Latins: the problems of the procession of the Holy Spirit, the state of souls after death, the use of unleavened bread, the eucharistic epiklesis, and the primacy of jurisdiction of the Pope. And so the Bull of Union was solemnly signed on the 6th July, 1439. Yet amongst the signatures, Mark of Ephesus, the principal opponent, was not found; and some other Greeks had signed under imperial pressure. The Emperor John VIII Paleologus wanted religious peace for a political end: the crusade against the Turks. These rather utilitarism motives had weighed

(2) *Dictionnaire de Théologie catholique.* Volume Nine. Article, « The Second Council of Lyons and reunion with the Greek Church », by Father V. Grumel; column 1391-1410.

on the debate and ultimately compromised the work of union. To explain this lack of success, historians have underlined the lack of psychological and moral preparation of the Byzantines, and the activities of certain schismatics who were opposed to all reconciliation. As in the case of the Council of Lyons, we are inclined to think that the union was not preceded by a long enough *rapprochement* between the separated Churches. Nevertheless, one must admit that the work of the Council of Florence did bear some lasting fruit. As Father V. Grumel has noted, « It is to this council that we owe the existence of practically all the Eastern Catholic Churches: Ruthenian, Melchite, Syriac, Rumanian... They were born, so to speak, from the principles of the Council, and in its light ». And the author concludes; « Still, today, Florence remains a symbol and an example. The principles which governed the union and the conditions in which it was made are the same today as then » (3).

Hope for the present time.

Before the Vatican Council, Pope Pius IX addressed an invitation to the Orthodox Patriarchs and bishops: « We exhort you », he wrote, « we beg you with all the ardour of which we are capable, to present yourselves at the general assembly of the bishops of the East and of the whole universe, as your fathers presented themselves at the second council of Lyons and at that of Florence, so that renewing the laws of age-old charity and reviving the peace of the earliest ages, whose fruits have been lost with the passage of time, we may at last see, after a long period of division, the rising and shining dawn of that pure union for which we all pray ».

Another letter from the Severeign Pontiff was addressed to the Protestants, to invite them to examine the problem of Christian unity. These appeals of Pope Pius IX came up against a brick wall. And if we seek to explain such a rebuff, we must recognise that minds and hearts were not ready for this work of union. The hostility and opposition between the separated Churches and Rome were well seen at the time of the Vatican Council. As with the preceding councils of Lyons and Florence, a lack of moral and intellectual preparation was fatal to the proposed work. No drawing together is possible whilst relationship and reactions are inspired by distrust. There can be no reconciliation if separated brothers do not mutually suffer because of the separation.

---

(3) V. Grumel. « Note on unity, in the light of Florence »; in the review *L'Unité de l'Eglise;* Nov.-Dec. 1937, page 157.

Today, it is quite a different story. Since the reign of Leo XIII the Popes have multiplied their appeals and their approaches with a view to unity. We have only to think of all they have done to promote knowledge and love of the Christian East. And as to the World Council of Churches, the instruction *Ecclesia Catholica* reminds us that the grace of the Holy Spirit is present in the development of this vast movement towards unity. But if the climate has changed for the better, it is chiefly due to the flood of prayer which began with the great Octave of Unity in January. This octave, now observed for fifty years, has made us understand that the miracle of reunion will not be the result of human scheming or of diplomatic parleying, but the fruit of single-minded brotherly prayer. That is why our hope does not run the risk of being disappointed. God does not abandon those who put their trust in His mercy.

Today, thanks to the action of the Holy Spirit, charity is flourishing on Christian soil. Age-old prejudices have crumbled away on all sides; the disciples of the one Christ have learnt once more to understand and to love each other. A sincere desire for union can be seen throught all Christendom. And this desire naturally begets prayer and sacrifice. May we not see, in the initiative taken by His Holiness John XXIII, the promise of better things to come for the Christian world, still in the pangs of division? How could God fail to respond to the expectation of His people who beseech Him to grant unity of hearts in love, and agreement of minds in the truth?

Jérôme Cornélis, A. A.

MARIAN DEVOTION AMONG ANGLO-CATHOLIC RELIGIOUS COMMUNITIES

The *Guide to the Religious Communities of the Anglican Communion* reports 89 communities of men and women in England, the United States, India, Canada, Wales, Scotland, Eire, South and East Africa, Australia, and New Zealand (1). There are 16 communities of men and 73 of women. Some are strictly contemplative, others live a contemplative-active life. Eleven of the sisterhoods are explicitly dedicated to the Blessed Virgin Mary according to the name of the community: (England) Community of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Society of Franciscan Servants of Jesus and Mary, Benedictine Community of St. Mary at the Cross, Community of St. Mary the Virgin, Benedictine Community of St. Mary's Abbey, Benedictine Community of the Salutation of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Society of the Servants of Mary; (Scotland) Community of St. Mary and St. John; (Eire) Community of St. Mary the Virgin; (Africa) Society of St. Mary at the Cross; (Unites States) Community of St. Mary.

Marian devotion as well as the corporate religious life was not always a part of Anglicanism. For over three hundred years there was no corporate religious life in the Anglican communion. Post Reformation canon law of the Anglicans forbade it. In the first three hundred years of the Establishment by act of the Crown, one notes some attempts to begin a kind of religious community life. There were so-called « Protestant Monasteries » and « Colleges of Maids », but the Anglican bishops banned such institutions as characteristic of « Popish Orders ».

In the first of the *Tracts of the Times* John Henry Newman in 1833 discussed the foundation of a religious community of men. Dr. Pusey began to consider the foundation of a convent for women. Almost at the same time in the American Protestant Episcopal Church, James L. Breck tried to form a quasi-monastic community on the shores of Lake Michigan. In 1840 Newman wrote to Mrs. J. Mozley:

---

(1) *Guide to the Religious Communities of the Anglican Communion* (London: Mowbray & Co., 1955), pp. ix, x, xi.

> We have bought nine or ten acres of ground at Littlemore, the field between the Chapel and the Barnes', and, so be it, in due time shall erect a monastic house upon it (2).

Newman, however, assured his bishop that his scheme was not « a revival of the Monastic Orders in anything approaching to the Romanist sense of the term » (3). Puseyite nunneries also began to be formed. These institutions mark the beginning of religious community life among the Anglicans.

A variety of causes contributed to these first attempts. The Tractarian Movement at Oxford, the Gothic revival, the desire of some men and women to give themselves more generously to Christ. In this era of beginnings it was of course expected that things would be in an experimental state. Newman, meanwhile, was converted to the Roman Catholic Church at Littlemore, and so his Anglican endeavor in the religious state came to an end.

At Llanthony, Norwich, in 1863, Joseph Leycester Lyne, known as Brother Ignatius of Jesus, founded a Benedictine community clothed in a habit composed of a Benedictine robe with Franciscan cord and sandals. Penances he prescribed were most austere, such as black fasts, sitting in ashes on Ash Wednesday, and long prostrations on Good Friday. Lyne considered his observance more primitively Benedictine than the Roman observance. He ruled the monastery as well as a cloistered convent of nuns as an autocrat according to his own lights.

Critics of the Anglican Religious were prone to say that they were indulging in the bizarre. This was the opinion of many of the Anglican bishops. However, the outstanding self-sacrifice of Anglican nursing Sisters in the Crimean war brought public attention to the worth of these dedicated souls. There was also the fear of conversions to Rome, unless Anglicanism provided its own religious communities. These conditions moved its bishops to approve and even aid such institutions in their dioceses.

With some few exceptions such as the Benedictine at Llanthony, there was no Marian cult among the early Anglican Religious of the last century. Auricular confession, reservation, vows, recitation of the Breviarium Romanum, invocation of Our Lady and the Saints, statues of Our Lord, Our Lady, and the Saints all came into religious practice gradually. Peter Anson in his comprehensive study of

---

(2) *Letters and Correspondence of J. H. Newman,* edited by Anne Mozley (1891), Vol. II, p. 305.

(3) *Ibid.,* pp. 393-4.

Anglican Religious, *The Call To The Cloister,* observes: « Few, if any, in the seventies (the eighteen seventies) had introduced the public invocation of Our Lady and the Saints » (4).

Anglican Doctrines and Our Lady

At the turn of the century a book was published in England which is important in the Marian literature of the Anglicans and which is found in the libraries of many of their Religious. I refer to A. Theodore Wirgman's *The Blessed Virgin and All the Company of Heaven.* In this work Wirgman laments the neglect of Our Lady by so many Anglicans in their doctrinal tenets:

> I am absolutely convinced that the neglect among us (Anglicans) of true teaching upon the position of the Blessed Virgin in the economy of Redemption has weakened our witness to the central truth of the Incarnation and has made possible amongst us a revival of the Cerinthian heresy with regard to the Virgin Conception and Virgin Birth of Our Lord (5).

It is noteworthy that within the Anglican Communion there exists widespread difference of opinions concerning the most basic tenets of the Christian religion. Our Lady is no exception to this rule. One cannot speak in a clear and unequivocal way about Anglican beliefs, precisely because there exists in Anglicanism no magisterium, no living rule of faith. The tripartite approach to Anglicanism as High, Broad, and Low is an overly simplified division of the manifold beliefs that exist within its confines. These are merely labels that in a general way classify trends, but the members of these trends must be identified individually according to their personal religious beliefs at a given time. This fact also holds true for the Anglican Religious. Just as one cannot speak of the beliefs of Anglicans but of the beliefs of some Anglicans, who have agreed upon something at a given time; so one cannot speak of the beliefs of Anglican Religious, but only of the individual beliefs of Anglican Religious and at a given time.

Medieval England, the dowry of Mary, is far removed in time

---

(4) Peter Anson, *The Call of The Cloister,* (N. Y.; Macmillan, 1953), p. 435. Also W. J. Sparrow Simpson, *The History of the Anglo-Catholic Revival from 1845.* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1932), pp. 230-245.

(5) A. Theodore Wirgman, *The Blessed Virgin And All The Company of Heaven,* (London: Cope & Fenwick & Buckingham, 1905), pp. xii, xiii.

and spirit from modern England. A visitor to Oxford may note the many statues of Our Lady that grace the niches of so many of the colleges, the central position of St. Mary's Church on the High, the many Lady Chapels, the various Marian scenes gorgeously depicted in stained glass, as the figures of Mary and her Divine Son both crowned and enthroned in the east window at Pusey House. One observes the presence of Anglican nuns in the city, but it would be a most superficial observer who would infer from all this that a widespread Marian trend is taking place in this famed center of learning. To the many Oxonians all of these Marian aspects are not significant of their devotion to Our Lady, any more than the coat of arms of Canterbury with its image of Our Lady and the inscription *Ave Marie Angliae* upon it stirs in the souls of many of its people the age-old dedication of England to Mary.

There is a Marian trend within contemporary Anglicanism, but it is small in the totality of Anglicans. Anglican Religious are by and large active in this trend. However, one must not overemphasize its importance, as if it is representative of Anglicanism in a marked way. This would not be in accord with the facts.

The relativism and personalism of Protestant beliefs, which is indicative of what Professor Tillich of Harvard calls « the Protestant principle », makes any survey of Protestant beliefs a difficult matter. A great deal of unrealistic work has been done by some in this field, who were altogether too anxious to report on Anglican beliefs as if a definite *corpus doctrinarum* exists to be surveyed.

Historical studies have been undertaken in an attempt to show that Anglicanism is linked with the great Marian tradition of England in Catholic times. A catena of Anglican divines particularly of the Caroline period is set forth to show a continuity of homage to the Mother of God, as if a pure Catholic trend continued to exist within Anglicanism.

Henry VIII in 1537 published a guide in doctrine to his bishops: *The Institution of the Christian Man* and in 1543 *A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition For Any Christian Man, Set Forth By the King's Majesty of England.* In both the Hail Mary is retained ([6]). In 1552 under Edward VI, the Forty-two Articles of Religion were drawn up by Cranmer and Ridley and in 1553 imposed on the nation. The XXIII Article reads « ... necnon de invocatione sanctorum, res est futilis, inaniter conficta et nullis Scripturarum testimoniis innititur ... » ([7]). There is evidently a clear break here from the Catholic tradition.

([6]) J. Dwyer, « The King's Great Matter » in *The Clergy Review*, March, 1951, (London: Burnes & Oates), p. 167.

([7]) Karl Muller, *Die Bikenntnisschriften der reformierten Kirche*, (Leipzig,

A kind of *via media* arose in the time of Elizabeth I which professed a favour of some Catholic doctrines and practices sheltered somewhat in the Book of Common Prayer. This High Church trend opposed the Calvinistic party which favoured a Genevan presbytery and the overturning of the Elizabethan settlement. The Forty-two Articles lay dormant for awhile under Elizabeth, but the parliament of 1563 approved a revision of them by Archbishop Parker assisted by Bishops Cox and Guest. These were formulated in the Thirty-Eight Articles and showed definite Lutheran influences. These Articles were gone over in 1571 and became the famous Thirty-Nine Articles which remain to this day the verbal content of Anglican beliefs.

None of the Thirty-Nine Articles can of course be cited in testimony of Anglican belief in the Catholic Marian cult. Article XXII is sometimes cited to prove in its revision that it was directed against Roman excesses in the invocation of the saints rather than against such invocation itself. Whereas Article XXIII in the Forty-Two Articles of 1552 spoke of the invocation of the saints as « scholasticorum doctrina », the revision in the Thirty-Nine Articles as Article XXII speaks of this doctrine as « doctrina Romanensium ». According to A. Wirgman, this was « a condemnation of medieval superstition and abuses » which was substituted for a condemnation of the Scholastic doctors which occurred in the Forty-Two Articles of 1553 (8). Canon Wirgman is to be lauded for his belief in the invocation of Our Lady, but the attempt to find belief implicitly contained in Article XXII of the Thirty-Nine Articles seems to be without sufficient foundation. One might suppose that the term « Romanensium » was used to correct abuse in the medieval cult of Our Lady and the saints in some of its expressions, but careful scholarship should attempt to establish this opinion by facts rather than by supposition as to what the terms of the Article mean.

Father John Baptist M. Smith, O. S. M. has written an important work on *The Nature And Development Of The Present Day Marian Cult In The Church of England* (9). The author gives special attention to the Anglican Divines of the Golden Age of Anglicanism in Part Two of this work. He examines the writings of King James I Richard Montague, Anthony Stafford, Joseph Hall, Jeremy Taylor,

---

1903), p. 513. Cf. also E. J. Bicknell, *The Thirty-Nine Articles*, (N. Y., Longmans, Green & Co., 1955) — a general exposition of each of the Thirty-Nine Articles.

(8) A. Wirgman, *The Blessed Virgin and All the Company of Heaven, op. cit.*, pp. 13-15.

(9) John Baptist, M., Smith, O. S. M., *The Nature And Development of The Present Day Marian Cult In the Church of England*, (Rome: Manuscript Copy. Marianum College, 1954), p. 84.

John Cosin, Herbert Thorndike, John Pearon, William Wake, William Clagett, and George Hickes. He concludes that in this period dating from the time of King James I (1603-1625) to the early part of the eighteenth century there is a marked change in these writers from the iconoclastic outbursts in the time of Edward and Elizabeth. Although the Anglican apologists continue to defend the Reformation destruction of the cult of Mary against the Catholic Apologists, there is a longing for the time when spiritually minded men pay their respect to the Mother of God.

Father Smith cautions, however, that these Caroline divines cannot be taken as models of present day devotion to Mary found in some instances among Anglicans. All the divines cited admit that honor should be paid to Mary as the Mother of God, and all wish that she would be for the people a model of the Christian virtues. She bears honorable titles and should have festivals held in her memory. However, she is not to receive religious cult because her offices as regard the human race ended in the divine maternity. Intercession is out of the question, except possibly in the writings of William Clagett.

On the contrary, some contemporary Anglican writers still invoke these Caroline divines in testimony of an unbroken Anglican trend in Marian devotion. The eminent Canon of Christ Church, Dr. Mascall, in his article in the symposium on *The Mother of God,* which is representative of contemporary Anglican devotion to Our Lady wrote:

> It would have been possible to produce a catena of Post-Reformation authorities to show that there have never been lacking Anglican theologians who were conscious of *the central theological importance* of the Mother of God ([10]).

Mascall quotes Anthony Stafford (1587-1645) in support of his claim. Stafford, a layman and close friend of Archbishop Laud, does display a devotion to Mary, but he does not go as far as many contemporary Anglicans. His remarkable work entitled *The Femall Glory* is unique as a seventeenth century work on the Blessed Mother for its respect for Mary and also for an engraving of Mary's corporeal assumption into heaven. Stafford pays Mary honor but no invocation:

> I am the first, to my knowledge, who hath written in our vulgar tongue on this our Blessed Virgin, drawn thereto, I

([10]) *The Mother of God,* A Symposium by Members of the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius, (Westminster: Dacre Press, 1949), p. 48.

> confess, by the strength of affection rather than ability. Yet withal I profess that I am her admirer, not her idolater, and that I in no way allow of their profane custom, who rob God of his honour and bestow it on her. But this I say, that though I impute not the late troubles and afflictions of the Protestant party in Germany to the small reverence there paid her (many of God's judgement according to Saint Austin, being secret, none unjust), yet truly I believe the undervaluing of one so great and dear in Christ's esteem cannot but be displeasing to Him, and that the more we ascribe to her (setting invocation apart) the more gracious we appear in His sight (11).

There is a certain awareness here of the central theological position of Mary, the Blessed Virgin, Mother of God, but it lacks the due honor (hyperdulia) that is to be paid to her, who enjoys the highest place in the Communion of Saints. Intercession is most certainly proper to her who as Mother of Christ is also Mother of Christians. This is part of the central theological position of Mary. Stafford lacks the grasp of this truly Catholic doctrine. Mascall rightly observes the Anglican development of Marian devotion.

> In actual fact such references, (in praise of Mary) while they exist, are lamentably rare, and are in quantity overbalanced by polemics which denounce devotion to Mary as popish, superstitious and even idolatrous. Only since the Oxford Movement have we recognized the realization that Christianity without Mary is a monstrosity, and even so this recovery has as yet affected only a tiny portion of the Anglican Church and has received neither encouragement nor understanding from the ecclesiastical authorities in these islands, who have almost without exception, condemned it as dangerous, ignored it as irrevelant, or when all else has failed, connived at it as an eccentricity (12).

One can truly say that there exists a relatively small number of Anglicans who believe in Mary, Mother of God, and who invoke her aid as well as pay honor to her high dignity. They are relatively small in relation to the total number of Anglicans. It cannot be said that they follow the commonly accepted beliefs of Anglicans, nor can it be said that they are part of a continuous tradition of devotees of Mary, who believed in Mary and practiced devotion to her as is done today. Among these present-day devotees of Mary

(11) A Stafford, *The Femall Glory or the Life and Death of Our Blessed Lady*, (London, 1635).

(12) *The Mother of God, op. cit.*, p. 48.

many Anglican Religious can be numbered, as also members of the Annunciation Groups (formed in opposition to the Church of South India) as well as parish groups and societies. For example, there is the *Fraternitas Dominae Nostrae De Salve Regina,* founded in the Church of St. Magnus the Martyr by London Bridge, A. D. 1343 and refounded on the Feast of the Nativity B. V. M., A. D. 1922. This Fraternity is aggregated to the Catholic League (Anglican) and with the Anglican Society of Our Lady of Walsingham. The famed medieval Walsingham shrine of Our Lady has been revived and is the scene of many pilgrimages by both Anglicans and Catholics. Church Unity Octave prayers recited in Anglican circles sometimes include invocations of Our Lady for the realization of the prayer of her Son: « That they all may be one ».

These expressions of public devotion to Our Lady exist in the same Anglican Communion which in the 1948 Lambeth Conference (the most widely representative expression of contemporary Anglicanism) in the *Encyclical Letter from the Bishops* presents a Protestant version of the doctrine of the communion of saints.

> The New Testament doctrine of the communion of saints is not concerned with any communication between the living and the departed ... The primary concern of the New Testament here is to insist upon the reality of a fellowship in Christ in which living and departed share. The Communion of Saints is apprehended in both the Eastern and Western Churches as a fellowship of mutual intercession. No distinction is drawn in this respect between saints and others; prayers are offered by the Church on earth even for the Mother of the Lord ... ([13]).

The document continues in a Calvinistic theme: « The only way to come closer to those who are departed in the faith of Christ is to draw near to God ... » ([14]). The Encyclical then goes on to allow private direct invocation of the saints after rejecting the practice of invocation *per se.*

> It is impossible to declare that departed saints cannot hear our prayers, and we therefore must not condemn as impossible direct address to them as a private practice, provided this be to ask their prayers whether for ourselves or for others; anything other than this seems to us both perilous and illegitimate ([15]).

([13]) *The Lambeth Conference, 1948, The Encyclical Letter from the Bishops,* (London: 1948).

([14]) *Ibid.*

([15]) *The Lambeth Conference, 1948, the Encyclical Letter from the Bishops* (London: 1948).

Anglican Religious and their fellow participants in the Marian cult cannot consistently adhere to the version of the Communion of Saints that was given by the Bishop's Letter at Lambeth. Logically one can find in their self-contradictory approval of private intercession of Our Lady a kind of half-hearted concession to the cause. One might say that Our Lady is making it quite difficult for her devotees in the Anglican Communion. May they recognize by the grace of Christ that their real home is in the one fold founded upon St. Peter and his successors where Marian doctrine and practice flourish in the supernatural life. By the grace of Christ through Mary may they not only recognize this truth but also their personal obligation to become members of this one and only fold.

KENNETH DOUGHERTY, S. A., S. T. D.

PRINCIPLES OF CATHOLIC ECUMENISM

1. Catholic Ecumenism has a sincere fraternal affection for our separated brethren. It looks upon them as brethren separated from us, not by their own deliberate choice, much less by ill-will, but separated by circumstances not of their making. .« Across all the imperfections of men », — our own imperfections as well as those of others — Catholic Ecumenism tries to make this fraternal affection evident and felt.

2. Consequently, our separated brethren are not theological adversaries to be refuted, but friends seeking with us a deeper love of Christ. Even if they do not agree with us as to the way in which Christ is best loved, we still love them because they love Christ, and because Christ loves them and makes them lovable.

3. Consequently, Catholic Ecumenism not only acknowledges but rejoices in all the good possessed by our separated brethren: the undoubted blessing and reality of their baptism into Christ, not into any « denomination », and very many gifts of nature and of grace which God has bestowed upon them. We rejoice to see gifts of God not only in individuals but also in corporate groups.

Let none be surprised at my saying that gifts of God exist in corporate dissident groups. Pope Pius XI said that rocks broken off from a gold-bearing seam may be themselves gold-bearing. It is, in fact, through the organized teaching of the Orthodox Churches that individuals come to love the Orthodox « tradition »; and it is through the organized teaching of other dissident bodies that individuals learn to love Christ, to repent of sins, to forgive enemies, to trust in the grace of God, to have hope in Christ amid the temptations, sorrows and afflictions of this world. Many hymns which can move every Christian heart have been preserved by corporate groups, and much doctrine that is true.

4. Catholic Ecumenism especially rejoices that so many have engaged in the efforts to overcome divisions among Christians. We, too, accept very many of their theological principles which the ecumenical movement has thrown into clearer relief. Instances of these truths are:

a) Christ founded only one Church, not many Churches.

b) The existing multiplicity of Churches is contrary to Christ's will.

c) The unity which Christ willed must be visible and outward as well as invisible and inward.

d)) Divisions among Christians are a hindrance to the acceptance of Christianity by non-Christians.

e) Non-theological factors to a considerable extent have caused divisions and continue to cause divisions. Every Catholic ecumenist asks himself whether his own imperfection and sinfulness may not impede him in making plain the glory of Christ's unity. Whether his own narrowness and ignorance may not cloud in the minds of others the height and the breadth of the Body of Christ.

5. Catholic Ecumenism realizes the need of patience. Charity is kind, is patient, is long-suffering. The divisions have been existing for some centuries and cannot, save by a miracle of God, be healed quickly. Inherited attitudes, group ideas, historical associations — all these are interwined with religion. Only with the patience of Christ can they be overcome, and not only by clever arguments or peevish confutations.

6. Catholic Ecumenism realizes that it is by good feeling as well as by good reasoning that our brethren will be brought back to the unity of Christ. The methods approved again and again by missiologists in dealing with non-Christian peoples and cultures are the methods which apply even more pertinently to dealings with separated Christian brethren. We do not try to convert non-Christians by showing them their errors but by showing how the separate truths they hold ought to develop into the Oneness of truth.

7. Catholic Ecumenism gives the fullest credit for good faith, good will, honest effort to non-Catholic ecumenists. Catholic ecumenists are well aware that the situation among non-Catholic denominations is not the same as it is among ourselves. Hence, we do not judge proposals for « reunions » among our separated brethren by the sole norm of what we know to be true, admit our ignorance of the actual circumstances in which our non-Catholic brethren are working and give them credit for sincerity in their struggle with the ignorance, the prejudices — both doctrinal and anti-doctrinal — and the sense of independence existing among members of « denominations ». Catholic Ecumenism admits that measures which would be inappropriate and even gravely wrong among Catholics may be permissible and appropriate among groups whose Christian beliefs are very vague and ill-defined.

8. If Catholic ecumenists sometimes call attention to ambiguities or what seems to them lack of grasp of fundamental and important principles, they do so in a spirit of helpfulness and a desire to support those ecumenists whose appreciation of their principles is not complete or whose appreciation of them is not shared by others. Catholic Ecumenism desires to help, and it is aware that — to express the matter in terms which ecumenists use — one of the best helps on the human level is the clearness and definiteness of Catholic theology.

Catholic Ecumenism exhorts to wise and to charitable speech. Wisdom must be based upon knowledge, and to obtain exact knowledge generally demands serious study and sometimes demands long and painful investigation. How vast has been the evil caused by false presentations of doctrines, of situations, even, sometimes, of personalities; how sad the history of the growth of misunderstandings and hostile feelings! Truth can be expressed in different ways. It is most readily accepted when it is expressed with sympathy as well as with knowledge. Sympathy without knowledge is futile; knowledge without sympathy is sterile.

9. Above all, Catholic Ecumenism is convinced to the depths of its being that it is only through humility that reconciliation can come. It is proud of Christs's Church and of the unity which Christ, (and not our efforts), has given and preserved. But Catholic Ecumenism, likewise, never forgets that Christ humbled Himself and appeared in outward form as though He were a mere man: His divinity was there and could be recognized, in the glory of the Cross as well as in the glory of His « signs » and His Resurrection.

Consequently, Catholic Ecumenism, *first, last, and always* prays. Only in the spirit of humble prayer can we do good for Christ and for His Church. Only God can overcome divisions so deep-seated and so long-standing. But the foolishness of God is wiser than men; the weakness of God is stronger than men, and because of this, and this alone, Catholic Ecumenism is full of hope, enthusiasm, and joyful zeal, and is never downcast by rebuffs, or annoyed by misunderstanding, or impatient because of delay. It relies on God and not on human efforts, though it strives to recoil at no labour, no effort, no humiliation to which God by His grace draws and inspires our weakness and frailty.

Bernard Leeming, S. J.

THE FORTHCOMING ECUMENICAL COUNCIL, AS SEEN BY THREE RUSSIAN THEOLOGIANS

The idea of summoning a new ecumenical council, as proposed authoritatively by His Holiness John XIII, has already given rise to numerous comments, even among separated Eastern Christians. In the following pages we shall consider three articles which have recently appeared in *Vestnik russkovo studenčeskovo christianskovo dviženija* (1). They seem to us particularly significant, as representing the attitude of the Russian Orthodox emigrés, and perhaps of others. The authors of these articles are well-known personalities in ecclesiastical circles, and they reflect the mainstream of thought in the present-day Orthodox world. They are: Bishop Cassian (Bezobrazov), Rector of the Russian Orthodox Theological Institute of Paris and Professor of Holy Scripture in the same Institute; archpriest George Florovsky, patrologist and Professor at Harvard University; and John Meyendorf, Professor of Byzantine Church History at the afore-mentioned Institute of Paris.

* * *

Bishop Cassian, in an article entitled « On the Convocation of the Ecumenical Council » (2), stresses above all the concern of the whole Christian world for the coming council, and he attributes this concern to the desire, stronger now than ever before, of achieving unity among Christians.

As he is unaware of the precise intentions of the Pope, he develops his theme on the supposition that the invitation to take part in discussions for the re-establishment of Church unity is addressed to all Christians separated from Rome, but that the meeting with the Protestants will take place in sessions parallel to those of the Council, while the meeting with the Orthodox will be within the scope of the Council itself. What chances are there of success for such a general council of union?

So far as the Protestants are concerned, the author thinks that though they are not indulging in immoderate hopes, there does

(1) *The Messenger of the Russian Christian Students' Movement*, N. 52, 1959, I, pp. 1-5.

(2) *Op. cit.*, pp. 1-5.

predominate among them a certain optimism, a hope of seeing the Church of Rome taking an active part at last on her own initiative in the Ecumenical Movement, and joining in with the World Council of Churches.

The position of the Orthodox is quite different.

The summons to the Council, as Bishop Cassian rightly observes, presupposes that essential unity already exists between the Christians who are called together. Now he goes on, there is no doubt that there already exists as a matter of fact between Catholics and Orthodox unity on a whole series of dogmatic truths and « facts of spiritual and liturgical experience », such as devotion to the Mother of God and to the Saints, belief in supernatural grace and the sacraments, mutual recognition of the validity of the sacraments administered in each other's communities. Such unity can be perceived, notably in contacts between the ordinary faithful; and it would permit, in itself, intercommunion. To this would be opposed certain principles solely of ecclesiastical discipline, particularly on the side of Rome, which requires prior agreement on each and every point of dissension.

The disagreement between Orthodox and Catholics reduces itself to three points, according to Bishop Cassian:

1) « The Roman Catholic doctrine concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit not only from the Father but also from the Son (*Filioque*) »;

2) « The doctrine of the conception of the Most Holy Mother of God by her parents, without the transmission to her of original sin »;

3) « The dogma of the Papacy ».

At this point Bishop Cassian departs considerably from the general viewpoint of the Eastern dissidents. He writes:

« The first two of these affirmations do not constitute an insurmountable obstacle to Church unity. The interpretation of the *Filioque* (« and from the Son ») in the sense of *per Filium* (« through the Son »), which was suggested even in the Byzantine epoch and was defended by many contemporary theologians, could be a means of getting over the first obstacle. As concerns the « Immaculate Conception », this is adopted as a dogmatic basis together with the dogma of the Assumption, defined by Pope Pius XII in the year 1951. This basis arouses objections from the Orthodox. Nevertheless, the cult of the Holy Mother of God, which presupposes the dogma of the Assumption, does in fact coincide with the cult which is paid to her in the Eastern Church » (3).

(3) *Op. cit.*, p. 3 -The definition of the Dogma of the Assumption took place on the Ist. November, 1950, and not in 1951.

One regrets the fact that Bishop Cassian appears to be quite unaware of the full agreement reached between the Orientals and the Latins on the question of the *Filioque* as long ago as the Council of Florence. One regrets, too, his inadequate understanding of Catholic Marian dogmas. But this first intellectually honest admission of the orthodoxy of the Catholic tradition would undoubtedly appear to be a real step forward towards mutual understanding and unity in the faith. Every sincere and dispassionate appraisal of the Catholic faith will surely bear fruit.

Our author's views on the question of the Papacy are altogether different. I quote what he says exactly:

« There remains the Papacy: that is to say, the doctrine of the Pope as the successor of the Apostle Peter, Head of the Church and Vicar of Christ on earth, and especially the dogma of Papal Infallibility, or at least the inerrancy of Papal judgements on questions of faith and morals, when pronounced *ex cathedra*: ' when fulfilling his office as pastor and teacher of all Christians ', as obligatory standards of belief and conduct. In this dogma which was set up at the Vatican Council in 1870, and which places the Pope above a Council, there is found the dogmatic and juridical fulfillment of the Roman Catholic Church, a structure which has been built up in the course of many centuries. No wonder the Church of Rome clings to this dogma more than to any other. If she gave way on this point, she would cease to exist as she is.

« For the East, this dogma is altogether unacceptable.

« According to present-day Eastern exegesis of the New Testament, we would not deny that the Apostle Peter held a position of primacy among the Twelve, nor would we deny that he underwent death for Christ's sake at Rome. The very text of Scripture speaks of the primacy of Peter (Matt. X, 2). Tradition teaches that he died as a martyr at Rome, and this is indirectly confirmed by the letter of the Apostle Peter. But all this does not oblige us to consider that he was the founder of the Church of Rome, nor to see in the Popes of Rome his successors on the episcopal throne. It cannot be proved that the Apostle Peter himself founded the Church of Rome, and in the historic context of the New Testament it seems rather unlikely. So the idea of the Apostle Peter as the first Bishop of Rome, that is, as the first Pope, is entirely foreign to Scripture. On the contrary, in the Gospel according to St. John (ch. XXI) the pastoral ministry of the Apostle Peter is presented as an absolutely unique ministry, similar to the pastoral ministry of Christ, receiving its fulfillment in the death as a martyr of the pastor himself, as an essential mark of this ministry, a mark which excludes every possibility of hierarchical transmission to successors. The Eastern

Church does not accept the doctrine of the Primacy of Peter in the Roman sense, above all because not merely is it not confirmed by the witness of Scripture, but it is openly contradicted.

« As regards the Infallibility of the Pope, Holy Scripture, which tells us nothing about the Popes of Rome as successors of the Apostle Peter, *a fortiori* says nothing about their infallibility. By recognizing the right of the Popes to pronounce infallible judgements, the Roman Church exalts them above the level of creatures, and attributes to them a divine power. For an infallible Pope occupying the place of Christ, there can be no place in Scripture » (4).

By taking such a position, Bishop Cassian will probably surprise a good many Catholics, and he will seem to them incomprehensibly severe. This contrasts with his more pacific and conciliatory approach to the first two points. Moreover, this stand seems even more severe than that which the same author took up in certain of his earlier writings on the fundamental question of the Primacy of St. Peter. In the review *Istina* (5) he sets forth at length his own personal interpretation of the primacy of St. Peter, collecting the evidence, as it seemed to him to be outlined in the books of the New Testament. But from the Catholic side he was met with various critical replies, particularly by the Reverend Father Benoit, O. S. B.(6); and faced with this criticism he remained, indeed, absolutely unshakable on his own exegetical interpretation; yet he seemed to admit (7) that it was founded on methodological hypotheses, no less than that of his opponents, and that a definitive solution of the question must be sought elsewhere, and not merely in direct personal exegesis of the New Testament. This he admitted, rightly and honestly; for in a theological and dogmatic investigation of the Christian revelation, it is not the private biblical exegesis of this or that particular expert that carries weight, but rather the unanimous biblical exegesis of the Fathers, taken together with living ecclesiastical tradition — this latter being interpreted as the faith which the Church professes and lives by, under the infallible guidance of the magisterium throughout the centuries. This is particularly true in what concerns the Roman primacy, for indeed Catholic theology has never based it solely on Scripture, but rather on the consensus of all the sources of revelation.

---

(4) *Op. cit.*, pp. 3-4.
(5) *Istina*, 1955, III, pp. 261-304.
(6) *Istina*, 1955, pp. 304-334.
(7) *Istina*, 1957, pp. 99-112, especially page 105. The Reverend B. Schultz, S. J., has now published a study of the ideas of Bishop Cassian, as expressed in much earlier writings.

Bishop Cassian will certainly be willing to take this traditional theological principle into consideration, and not to reject the very possibility of conversations on the subject, or better still, of a more exhaustive study of the scriptural foundations themselves, particularly those which are of basic importance concerning ecclesiastical tradition, the Primacy of Peter and that of Rome. This could take place either within the council itself, as happened in the case of the *Filioque* and the other matters of disagreement in the Council of Florence, or in some other, less official, meeting.

In the last part of his article Bishop Cassian comes to a very pessimistic conclusion as to the possibility of success for a future general council of unity. Even if full accord were reached on all other matters at present under discussion, « agreement will not be reached and cannot ever be reached on the principle point », that is on the doctrine of the universal primacy and infallibility of the Pope.

Nevertheless, he concludes his observations by saying that the council, if it takes place, will do much good, by bringing Christians closer together. Moreover, he humbly recognises our own helplessness and he declares: « Nobody can take from us our ultimate hope in a miracle ».

* * *

The article of Archpriest George Florovsky, « On the Forthcoming Council of the Roman Church » (8) reveals a man who is conscious of his own responsibility. His essay has a more concrete and practical character, pointing out the duties which seem to him to fall to theologians and to the shepherds of the Church.

The coming council, says Florovsky, dealing as it must with unity between Christians, will have the Church as its necessary central theme. The council will have above all to « give an authentic explanation of the ' Dogma of the Vatican ' in the wider context of the doctrine of the Church. In this context, one may suppose, the ' Dogma of the Vatican ' will itself appear in a new light » (9). He admits that the Catholic Church « is today going through a flourishing period, theologically and liturgically »; therefore he hopes that the council, even if it be confined to the Roman Catholic Church, will be prepared with a profound sense of responsibility and with the necessary freedom of theological thought. In the preparations for the council it will be necessary to take into account the great variety and strength of theological thought and

---

(8) *Vestnik*, pp. 5-10.
(9) *Op. cit.*, p. 6.

spiritual experience in these days, even when these are found outside the ambit of the Roman Church.

The author particularly hopes that in leading up to the council some reckoning will be taken of the results of biblical and historical research within the Catholic Church herself; and that in theological arguments more importance will be given to the testimony of the Fathers than was the case in the scholastic age and has been ever since. He hopes that the problem of tradition will be gone into deeply, even if it must result in a considerable modification of the decrees of the Council of Trent.

Florovsky declares also that a certain amount of publicity could do nothing but good in the preparations for the work of the council. The subjects of the council must be freely discussed in theological reviews. The whole Church must feel an interest and a personal concern in the « problem of the council ». « All the members of the Church must consciously uphold the faith with a sense of responsibility, and naturally, in loyalty to ecclesiastical tradition and in obedience to legitimate pastoral authority. The *consensus fidelium* cannot help but reinvigorate the faith of the Church » (10).

In the second part of his article, Florovsky deals with the coming council as it concerns the Eastern Orthodox. He rules out, at this moment of history, the opportuneness and usefulness of a « formal meeting of the Churches », because today neither the East nor the West would be spiritually prepared for such a meeting, which presupposes a long « molecular » preparation at different levels of Church life and practice. The writer would consider it inopportune that Orthodox should be present at the forthcoming council, even just as observers. Instead, he thinks it would be possible, and a good thing, to have some Orthodox theologians taking part — « naturally, with the agreement of ecclesiastical authority, and only in the capacity of ' qualified persons ' » — in the preparatory discussions before the council, under the form of an exchange of views and information. Such an exchange of ideas would not be a novelty, for it has been going on for some time, and clearly very usefully, between Catholic and Protestant theologians. But it is necessary that these contacts should be made in an atmosphere of mutual trust and respect, with humbleness, charity, and deference to the Truth.

«But it is clear », adds the writer, « that true success in this case depends precisely upon mutual trust, spiritual earnestness, and awareness of responsibility before God. On the other hand

(10) *Op. cit.*, p. 8.

it is evident that such ecumenical contacts must not be made to await what simply cannot happen. The ' equality of rights ' or the ' equality of worth ' of all the ' confessions ' which exist, that is in fact of ' all the heresies ' is a futile dream, and one that is dangerous and altogether sterile » (11).

As to the Orthodox themselves, Florovsky thinks that it behoves them now on their side to face up to « the fundamental problem ... in all its tragic complexity ».

« What really happened in 1054, or even before, or maybe only later? Wherein lies the essence of ' schism '? Should this schism be called ' Byzantine ' or ' Roman '? What exactly is the Roman Church from the point of view of Orthodox ecclesiology? Has the Roman Church preserved ' orthodoxy ', that is ' the true faith '; and to what extent? Or has she fallen irreparably into ' heresy '? This problem must be the starting-point. It is clear enough that on such subjects the Orthodox are not in agreement among themselves » (12).

In fact, while some Orthodox theologians consider the Roman Church as a « part » of the true Church, which has however fallen into schism, others deny that Roman Catholicism has any of the characteristics of the Church. They rebaptise converts from Catholicism, they insist on the absence of grace in everything Roman, and all the « facts of spiritual life » are attributed quite unreservedly either to diabolical inspiration or to psychological disease or to illusion (13).

In view of this radical diversity of attitude amongst the Orthodox in all that concerns the Roman Church, Florovsky asserts that before considering an official meeting with Catholics, Orthodox theologians and Church authorities have the duty and the necessity of examining themselves frankly and sincerely concerning the problem of the nature of the « Roman Church », and then of working out in all its fulness and complexity the general doctrine of the Church.

The writer finishes his article by admitting that, in any case, the calling of a new general council, even if only within the limits of the Church of Rome, undoubtedly represents a new and important ecumenical fact, which calls for careful attention from Orthodox theologians.

Thus, Professor Florovsky has most realistically put his finger on the actual situation. The lack of a clear ecclesiology, and one admitted by all Orthodox, and the doctrinal divisions which exist

(11) *Op. cit.*, p. 8.
(12) *Op. cit.*, p. 9.
(13) *Op. cit.*, pp. 9-10.

today within Orthodoxy, make it useless, dangerous and even harmful for them to have a « formal meeting » or any official participation in the next council. Instead they would be well advised to exchange views sincerely during the preparations for the council; and they have the duty of giving active attention to the development of such a great event.

* * *

The position taken up by Professor Meyendorf is much more radical than those of the other two. He seems to adhere unreservedly to the most advanced Chomjakovian theological party ([14]), which is trying assiduously in these days to construct an original and independent Orthodox ecclesiology, but which is arriving at formularies which are absolutely new even to dissident Eastern theology.

Professor Meyendorf entitles his article: « What is an Ecumenical Council? » ([15]). Here is his opinion:

Although the Orthodox consider as ecumenical only the seven great general Councils which were held between the 4th and 8th centuries in historical circumstances which can never be repeated, yet the ecclesiastical significance of the councils can never be changed, because it is bound up with the very nature of the Church. And so —

« In the Orthodox view, each local church, headed by its bishop, is the Church of God, enjoying His blessed gifts and constituting not just a part of the Body of Christ, but the whole of His Body in its sacramental reality. The head of each Church, the bishop, performs the function of a teacher, and receives, in the words of St. Irenaeus of Lyon, « the gift of truth » (charisma veritatis certum) But no one church can live in isolation from the others: unity of origin and faith links them all in a single life, and one transmits to another the grace of episcopacy through the laying on of hands. Community of life inevitably leads to a search for common decisions in matters important to all the churches. If each church enjoys in full the gifts, and consequently the truth of God, it follows that it has the right to seek from other churches the best means of expressing this truth. The other churches help it to submit to the will of God, preserve it from any possible fall-

---

([14]) A. S. Chomiakoff († 1860) was a lay theologian whose influence on Russian theological thought is still strong. He taught that the essence of the Church lies in unity, liberty and love, and that there is no distinction between the teaching Church and the taught. The Catholic Church (he said) lacks love; the Protestant Churches, unity. The Anglican William Palmer had a long correspondence with him, later edited by W. J. Birkbeck. (Ed.).

([15]) *Vestnik*, pp. 10-15.

ing away from the truth, and restore those things in which it is untrue to its own nature.

« Thus very early, in the 2nd century, the institution of Councils arose, in the form of assemblies of bishops of the various churches, who took decisions on disputed Church questions with the help of God, often in the presence of the people and in any case with the people's agreement and approval. The meaning of these councils was that they provided an authoritative indication of what was God's will; they did not seek to achieve human unanimity of opinion but to elucidate God's truth. Because of this, the Councils were not subject to any law of numbers or majorities; each decision by a Council was a miracle of God's presence in the Church, and those who did not agree with this revelation left the Church » ([16]).

In other words, according to Meyendorf, each local church with a bishop at its head is to be identified with the « Church of God », with the Church as such, and it is in possession of all the gifts of grace and therefore also of the fullness of truth ([17]). It is linked with the other churches only through the ordination of the bishop and by the bonds of mutual charity and communion of faith. But naturally it will seek, in collaboration with the others, joint solutions to common religious problems, and agreed formulations of the common faith. This in fact took place in history by means of the councils. The dogmatic implication and the task of such meetings is this: to show forth and bear witness to Divine Truth, which exists in all its fullness in the individual local churches, and to coin the most appropriate joint formulations thereof. But the work of the councils is in every case subject to the consent and approval of the Christian people.

The « ecumenical » councils, continues Meyendorf, arose in the new historical circumstances of the 4th century, as a new substantial form of the ancient institution of the councils. The novelty lay in the active participation of the state in Church life. The Christian emperors wanted to lay down Christian truth as the foundation of the constitution of the state; but to do this they needed an expression of that truth in clear formularies and precise definitions, which then became laws of the state. To do this they organized

---

([16]) *Op. cit.*, pp. 10-11.

([17]) Incidentally, we cannot understand how one can identify the local diocesan church with the Church as such, without contradiction; nor how one can attribute to it the fullness of divine gifts, including the gift of Truth, and yet consider it fallible and defectible! But in fact our writer does so consider it, when he says: « The other churches ... restore those things in which it is untrue to its own nature ».

« ecumenical » gatherings of the episcopate, that is to say of the whole Empire.

No particular bishop — so says Meyendorf — not even the Pope of Rome, had the right of taking the initiative in the calling of such councils; they had not even the right to exempt themselves from taking part, because participation was considered as their civil duty.

In this imperial and state character of the « ecumenical councils » is to be found the reason (again, according to Meyendorf) why after the 9th century there were no more ecumenical councils. Byzantium always regarded the West as being under its jurisdiction; to have summoned an « ecumenical » council without the participation of the West would have meant that the Byzantine emperors were renouncing their international pretentions.

Despite this, the ecumenical councils kept their dogmatic significance:

« Their stormy history and gradual acceptance shows that the the truth which they proclaimed was alive within the Church independently of earthly historical circumstances. More than once it happened that a council which had been formally summoned as « ecumenical » (e. g. the Ephesus Council in A. D. 449 or the Florence Council in 1439) turned into an « outlaw » council, whose decisions were rejected by the Church. On the other hand, several councils which consisted of a comparatively small number of bishops (e. g. the second or fifth Ecumenical Councils) went down in Church history as « ecumenical » councils because the Church recognized their decisions as in fact proclaiming the truth, not because of the formal signs which made them « ecumenical » bodies. It was not the ecumenical nature but the closeness to the truth of these councils which made their decisions obligatory upon us » ([18]).

Meyendorf asserts that it is possible for a council to be formally ecumenical yet not to teach the truth. But he does not tell us the criterion according to which the Church of the individual faithful can and must recognize this conformity of the councils to the truth, which renders them binding in conscience. The criterion of « gradual acceptance » is too vague. Who, indeed, can say authoritatively that a particular council has been « accepted »? And who are the people who have the duty of « accepting » the council, so that it may be revealed as an authentic council, teaching the truth, and not a « latrocinium »? In the examples given — the Council of Florence and, further on in the article, the local councils of Constantinople in the 14th century, « which defined the Orthodox doctrine of grace » — we cannot find any objective norm. The Council

---

([18]) *Op. cit.*, pp. 12-13.

of Florence was in fact accepted by the majority of Christians at that time, while the Councils of Constantinople of the 14th century did not agree with each other on the Palamitic question (19), and the decisions arrived at Constantinople cannot be said to have been accepted as definitive even amongst all Orthodox.

« The Church », says Meyendorf, « is a miracle of the presence of God with men, and ... this overshadows any formal ' signs ' or ' infallibility '. It is not enough to summon an ' ecumenical ' council ... For it to pronounce the truth it is also necessary that amongst those present there should be He Who said: ' I am the Way, the Truth and the Life '. Without His presence, however big the assembly, it will not be in the Truth » (20).

Nobody will deny that the reason for the infallibility of the dogmatic formularies of the ecumenical councils does not rest merely in the number of those assembled nor in their natural intellectual endowment, but in the presence of the Holy Spirit. But the real question is this: when, as a matter of fact, was this presence given? And how can the faithful of every age recognize it with certainty?

Meyendorf thinks that: « For the Orthodox Church the only criterion of truth is God Himself, Who mysteriously lives within the Church, leads her into the paths of truth, and expresses His will in the wholeness (catholicity) of her life ») (21).

This is a vicious circle, however, unless the writer means to say that God reveals Himself and His truth personally to each individual Christian: but in this case one can no longer speak of an objective revelation, nor of an external, universal, and obligatory profession of faith for all who wish to be faithful to Christ and members of His Church. We find ourselves, in fact, in complete subjectivism.

Hence, having placed such premises, Professor Meyendorf's conclusion seems somewhat rhetorical:

Eventually truth « may again be manifested at a new Ecumenical Council which will unite not only the Orthodox Churches, but also the Churches of the West.

« The whole question is: is there any hope that the Council proposed by Pope John XXIII will be not only an ecumenical, but

---

(19) Palamism, named from Gregory Palamas († 1359), archbishop of Salonica, who in the bitter controversy that raged in Constantinople in the first half of the XIVth century defended the hesychastic method of prayer. His teaching about the Blessed Trinity, though admitted by most Orientals, is considered unsound by Catholics. (Ed.).

(20) *Op. cit.*, p. 13.

(21) *Ibid.*

a *true* one? The Orthodox attitude towards the proposal depends on the answer given by Rome to this question » ([22]).

Meyendorf thinks that the Orthodox will be able to take part in an ecumenical council along with Catholics only on condition that the agenda should include « a re-appraisal of the enormous and fundamental evolution which has taken place in the life of the Western Church between the 9th and 20th centuries. For this evolution contains the main obstacle to the unity of Christians in the one true faith ([23]). Unfortunately, it is hardly likely that such a revision is being considered at Rome ».

Given the definition of the infallibility ([24]) of the Pope, Meyendorf wonders what is the point of the council, and whether there is any place for the Episcopate in the Church ([25]).

The conciliatory tone of Pope John XXIII, and the invitation of Eastern Orthodox Patriarchs, if it really occurs, to take part in the coming council, seem to the writer positive facts, but not decisive ones. To achieve Church unity — which according to the writer's understanding of the Orthodox conception consists in the profession of the same faith — it is necessary to get « back to the sources », that is, « to the Truth which abides within the Church ». « An Ecumenical Council could be one of the means towards achieving unity of faith, and it ... would demand long preparation and a genuine effort of self-sacrifice and love » ([26]).

* * *

To sum up this review with some general observations, we may notice above all a certain anxiety among Russian Orthodox emigrés. One gets the impression that the announcement of a new ecumenical council has taken them by surprise in a state of complete unreadiness for such an important event; — an event which they themselves have so often asked for as the only effective remedy for a divided Christendom.

The first and most elementary ecclesiastical truth, namely that there is but one true Church of Christ, seems to be making more

---

([22]) *Op. cit.*, pp. 13-14.

([23]) *Ibid.*

([24]) Professor Meyendorf insists on using the rather equivocal Russian term « nepogrešimost » (and its derivatives) to describe the concept infallibility, though there exists a more exact term, « bezošibočnost », commonly used by Russian Catholics.

([25]) *Vestnik*, p. 14.

([26]) *Op. cit.*, p. 15. Professor Meyendorf has published his article also in English in the review *Syndesmos* (Series 2, no. 8, May 1959, pp. 3-7: « What is an Ecumenical Council? »). He also dealt with the same subject at a rally of Russian students held at Bievre near Paris on the 16-18th May last year by the Russian Students' Christian Movement. (See the journal *Russakaja mysl'*, published in Paris, no. 1375, of the 30th May, 1959, p. 4, col. 1).

of an impression these days on the minds of Orthodox theologians. Hence, the problem becomes more serious for them: Where is the real Church of Christ? And how is a certain answer to be found to such a question?

Their *amour-propre* rebels — and humanly speaking we can understand this — against recognising the truth of the Roman Church without qualification.

The Council of Lyons, and above all the Council of Florence, have made the way clear. They even achieved unity of faith and of ecclesiastical communion, though only for short periods of time. But the Orthodox generally refuse even to hear or speak of these Councils. This is probably because in the light of these councils it is difficult to find a reasonable justification for their present state of dissidence. But such a refusal carries with it their last resort for overcoming disunity and re-establishing Christian unity. If in fact they reject the validity of, for example, the Council of Florence, which was obviously ecumenical, no other objective criterion is left by which to judge the authenticity and validity of any other such ecumenical council. In fact, if they want to be logical, they will have to deny the infallibility of such councils altogether, or fall back on essentially subjective criteria. But this leads, not to ecclesiastical unity, but rather to subjectivism or ecclesiastical agnosticism, and to chaos in the realm of practical Church life.

And so, in fact, it is working out.

The Eastern Orthodox Church is in truth today no longer a real social entity. Rather, we find ourselves confronted by a variety of national ecclesiastical communities, autonomous and independent of each other, and quite frequently hostile and divided among themselves, lacking any true social unity. Since they do not acknowledge any authentic, objective, universal and living teaching organ, their unity of faith is seriously affected. It is reduced to a handful of truths generally acknowledged as defined dogmas. This allows theological movements to grow up which are quite foreign to ancient Christian tradition.

Faced with this actual situation, and taking into account other not inconsiderable difficulties, one can well understand the attitude of abstention and great reserve which the Orthodox theologians have deemed prudent to adopt towards the Pope's proposal.

Nevertheless, the suggestion that there might be informal contacts with Catholic theologians will certainly encourage a real drawing together of Catholics and Orthodox, on condition only that such contacts be really dominated by charity and an absolute submission to Truth.

Paul Leskovec, S. J.

PERSONALITIES OF THE COUNCIL OF FLORENCE

IV. Mark Eugenicus, Metropolitan Of Ephesus

« This great beacon of life in the world, who proved himself to be also light and good salt to the Church of Christ, stalwart champion of the truth and sun that illuminates the whole earth, put forth his first beams from the great and imperial city, from this famous Constantinople that is, for in it he was born (1), nurtured and educated, and finally here, too, in his transit to God he put off his holy body. His parents were George, deacon and sakellios of the great church, whom the great city at that time enriched by giving a double charge — over the church of Christ and over a throng of youths, who from all parts gathered round him — and Maria Loucas, the daughter of a pious and God-beloved doctor. Enquiry revealed that their forebears on both sides were endowed with nobility, moderate wealth and worldly excellence, as well as piety and virtue.

« The boy, then, in the rite of regeneration by the divine Spirit, received the name of Manuel (no other, indeed, was suitable), for he was worthy of the first of all names, the name of the Lord, and later it was through him that there abode with us God and true religion and our ancestral faith. Till he was in this studies of rhetoric he had as his teacher his father, whom he shortly surpassed in wisdom and virtue; for indeed he excelled his father as much as his father (who gladly experienced what all fathers desire, to be out-distanced by their children) himself outdid all the rest. Orphaned, however, of such a father in his thirteenth year, he did not allow himself to turn towards ease, but preferred immediately to frequent the best and most famous teachers. These were, first, John Chortasmenus, who under the name of Ignatius later adorned the throne of the province of Selymbria; then, for the more advanced of the general and philosophical studies, George Gemistus. With them, by his extreme zeal, his industry and marvellous natural gifts, in a short time he gained great profit. Besides, his good, reverent and moderate disposition, his manner, too, as regards style

(1) Probably in the year 1394.

of dress, gait, glance and gesture, that had the gravity of riper years and added grace to his speech and appearance, made him an object of admiration not only to his fellow-students but also to his masters and, in a word, to everybody.

« So, after a good and saintly youth, he set his hand to many important tasks, wherein he achieved wondrous success. At one time he took over the school that had been his father's and the care of the young, from which there issued many a scholar and teacher; at another, throughout a whole year he never failed to be present daily at the holy celebrations in the great church, no matter the season whether winter or summer, practising thus in anticipation while he was yet a layman the life of the monk, altogether godly and enlightened and in reality being and seeming to be a philosopher while still in tender youth; at yet another, in night-long struggles meditating within himself and storing up for himself the wisdom of the ancients, he neglected nothing that would make for completeness either of the divine scriptures and the holy doctors or of secular knowledge.

« While yet in his twenty-sixth year, after having distributed generously and freely all his goods to the poor, he put on the goodly yoke and the light burden of the Lord that he had yearned for from boyhood. He embraced the solitude dear to Elias and John and their associates, the tranquillity that is the mother of interior calm and peace and quietude and the ascent to God and familiarity with Him, and having chosen the islands that lay before his native shores and were at that time adorned with many a godly man, he picked out for himself the best spiritual guide of them all, the late wondrous Symeon. At his disciple he straightway shaved his head in the style of monks and girt himself for spiritual combat and labors, having left behind unconsolable grief to his kin, his familiars, friends, the Emperor who desired and needed his wisdom and knowledge, to the dignitaries, to the clergy, to the throngs of youths whom he had educated — in a word, to all his fellow-citizens by whom his withdrawal from their life and the loss of the great man's high qualities that had been at everyone's disposal were obviously regarded as a kind of common bereavement .

« In his holy purpose he had had Dorotheus as co-operator and helpmate, a man reverent and earnest, of education and nobility of disposition, who was the son of Balsamon the great sacristan of the great church, in youth his intimate confidant, friend, companion of like age and associate in studies, who later had joined him in a pact that both, with God's help, should, no matter the cost, become monks. This came about shortly after, for at one time Jerusalem and the Holy Mountain of Sinai embraced Dorotheus,

happily fulfilling there his aim, though shortly he returned and went and put himself under obedience to the above-mentioned Symeon; while the island of Antigone had lately received Mark under the same father and guide.

« But that holy routine of solitude and peace was not to continue for long. Before a second year had run its course, the foolish instability of the policy of that time was already throwing the common weal into confusion, and the new Arab beast, by now the only satrap left of the Ishmaelites, girt the great city round with an immense host. The danger for those in the islands was manifest. The marvellous one returned from the wilderness with his father and guide, and chose to make his abode in the holy and famous monastery of the Mangani, seeing that it, more than the others, offered greater facilities for the hermit's life so dear to him. There, then, he gave himself to harsh mortification, fasting, watchings and night vigils, especially when he was left in solitude, and he would say: ' God is served by nothing so much as by the endurance of suffering '. So he gained the victory in the struggle against the well-known adversaries and, raised to the heights of contemplation and holy illuminations and divine radiations (when he wrote many, most useful works) and become wholly venerable and Godlike, he received the priesthood, but only with reluctance and under pressure and after much urging, seeming to the onlooker, when he was offering the bloodless sacrifice to God, completely ravished, completely illuminated, completely out of himself in consecration to God, like some angel incarnate.

« There followed the far greater and more striking achievements and the brilliant and noble trophies of the thrice-conqueror. For, when our thrice-miserable nation besides others was about to sustain the disaster of the Church, and a union of that kind was on the point of being devised and accepted — when preparations for this was being made, yielding to earnest prayers and persuasions of all sorts he was raised to the lofty See of Ephesus, he who was in truth worthy of greater, and indeed of the very first, honors, great high priest, who proved himself the zealous imitator of the great and first High Priest and Shepherd, such as the great Paul described him; truly another Basil the Great, both in appearance and in name. For when the Emperor with the Patriarch and all the clergy after the voyage had reached Italy, he alone from first to last proved himself a double-edged blade to destroy the bastard and evil cockle amidst the true harvest of the holy doctrine of the Church; herald too of godly theology and inexhaustible river of orthodox writings and definitions of the holy Fathers, with piercing and honey-sweet, nectar-burdened voice and fearless and noble disposition of soul.

« All people and nations of those there present know the sophistical twists and turns and modes and deceits and guiles of the other's arguments (to speak with as little bitterness as I can), and how by the pure theology of the Fathers, beginning from the first Theologian Himself and Head of theologians, the God-Word, and onwards, and by the oecumenical decisions and even indeed with the force of apodictic and undeniable syllogisms he dissipated them like smoke or froth, both in the discussions about Purgatory and in those on the Addition that they had dared to make to the holy Creed, and finally about the doctrine itself. Then he stood out more conspicuously than any monument and the holy theology of the great man and his learning and the grace of the most Holy Spirit that was in him and the whole force of truth, and the rottenness and the insecurity of the Latin beliefs were plainly disclosed, just as recently in his homeland in three conferences, even if those who think and say the contrary burst themselves.

« When the consent of the majority procured by wiles and devices, had been brazenly given, and when as one condemned he stood before the so-called Supreme Pontiff two separate times (like in this to Basil before the eparch), on one of those occasions he answered joyfully and on the other he managed with prudent silence to soothe the irrational anger, after the fashion of the mild and innocent Jesus before the high priests and scribes of His time, so by the providence of God, against all probability, he escaped the danger and returned in safety with renown to his native land, openly admired and honored by all. Having remained a short while he set off for his own flock, withdrawing from the bustle of the world -- the good shepherd who laid down his life for the sheep, and the most genuine imitator of the true and first Shepherd — to visit his own children, the Christians in the midst of the infidel wolves.

« So, in long journeys, with sweat and toil, though in poor bodily health, visiting holy temples in distress especially that of the metropolitan church with its adjacent buildings, ordaining priests, helping the victim of injustice even if it brought with it persecution and trials at times from the infidel, assisting widows and orphans, checking, chiding, exhorting, warning, converting, supporting, become all things to all men according to the aposile, he spent his time traversing in every direction the area that fell by lot to the great John, the evangelist and theologian. When the affairs of his flock were sufficiently set in order, stricken with a longing for the peace of that contemplation he had always ardently desired, he planned to cross from the East to the holy Mount of Athos to spend there the rest of his life on some desert spot. But while passing innocently through some strait, he put in at the island of Lem-

nos and there, having tarried a little for a moderate relaxation and having gone ashore, he was immediately recognised and, recognised, arrested on the spot.

« How could anyone sufficiently admire him in this place either for the magnanimity he showed and his endurance in evil plight, in resisting the fierce heat and the frequent lack of necessaries and in combatting diseases one after another, or for his patience in bitter confinement when the fleet of the infidel Ishmaelites girt the island round and was set on destroying it, and, in a word, in afflictions of all kinds for two full years.

« But seeing that he was not allowed to set foot in any way on Athos, the champion returned straightway from his exile to his fatherland, already the complete, new confessor of the faith, honored and reverenced and justly acclaimed by all.

« There, then, after a life dear to God, a brilliant exemplar in all things — in his manner of life in youth before he assumed the monastic habit, in the holy monastic habit too, in the degrees of the high-priesthood, in discussions for the orthodox faith and his bold profession of orthodoxy — in the course of the fifty-second year of his earthly life, on the twenty-third day of the month of June he departed with joy to Him with Whom, in the words of Paul, he desired to be dissolved and to be, Whom he had honored with sound theology, had served throughout his life, had glorified by good works. With general concourse and honor and the reverence of the poplace, to the glory of God Who is rendered glorious and admirable in His saints, the holy and precious casket and shrine of his sanctified soul was reverently set to rest in the same holy monastery of the Mangani of the divine martyr George, after he had laid many injunctions and paternal commands on those present, regarding the righting of the ecclesiastical situation and sound doctrine in us, and the public vindication of the right doctrines of the Church, and the subversion of the innovation. Then joyfully uttering as his last words: ' My Lord, Jesus Christ, Son of the living God, into Thy hands I commend my spirit ', so saying he passed to Him. By his intercession, Christ God, and that of all Thy holy Doctors and the Father theologians, preserve Thy Church forever in the orthodox faith ».

Such is the brief ' life ' of Mark Eugenicus that, a short time after his death, his brother John composed as part of a liturgical office in his honor. It is our chief source for knowledge of Mark's earlier years. About his activity in the Council of Florence and later, information is more plentiful. When the Turkish authorities refused to allow the three oriental patriarchs to attend the Council, first he was chosen as his proxy by the Patriarch of Alexandria; then,

to his chagrin, he became instead procurator of the lesser of Jerusalem; in the end, owing to another change made after the arrival in Italy, he acted for Antioch.

He was looked upon as a leading theologian of his Church, and that was probably one of the main reasons why he was raised to the throne of Ephesus on the eve of the Council, at about the same time that Bessarion, Isidore and Dionysius were also consecrated archbishops. In the early months of inactivity at Ferrara, at the suggestion of Cardinal Cesarini but not on the lines or with the purpose proposed by the Cardinal, he addressed a composition to Eugenius IV, an exhortation in beatifully balanced, simple and impassioned Greek, urging that, as a pope had started the schism by putting the *Filioque* into the Creed, the Pope could easily, in the well-disciplined Latin Church, end it by removing the offending word. The address reached, not the Pope, but the Emperor, who would have had Mark punished by the Greek synod if Bessarion had not intervened to calm the storm. That effusion reflected Mark's views perfectly, and he never changed them — the *Filioque* was heretical, and the only way to ecclesiastical peace was for the Latins to delete it.

Mark was a member of every doctrinal committee formed on the Greek side. He and Bessarion were the two appointed spokesmen for the Greeks, and Bessarion spoke but little — once in the preliminary meetings in May 1438, once about Purgatory, and during two sessions about the addition of the *Filioque* to the Creed (1, 4 November). In all the other sessions in Ferrara and in all without exception of those in Florence, Eugenicus was the Greek speaker. In the meetings about Purgatory, conciliatory at the beginning, Mark hardened in his opposition the more he went on. In the discussion about the Addition, his position was simple and final — the Council of Ephesus forbade any change for all time in the Nicene Creed, and he repeated that as an answer to every Latin argument. Quite arbitrarily, he treated the Constantinopolitan Creed as if it were the original Nicene, and blandly brushed aside all argument drawn from the fact that, whereas the Creed mentioned by the Council of Ephesus was specifically the Nicene, both his Church and the Latin Church had over centuries used not that but the Nicene-Constantinopolitan, i. e. the Nicene with many changes. In Florence, where the doctrine of the *Filioque* was in debate, five sessions were passed in fruitless assertion and counter-assertion about the wording of a few texts from the Fathers; in the sixth, Mark exposed his scriptural and patristic reasons for rejecting the Latin doctrine. He did not attend the seventh and eighth when Montenero ably developed the Latin case.

Not that it would have made much difference, even if he had been present at Montenero's exposition. Mark was impervious to argument. The Latin spokesman had quoted, besides scripture, a most imposing array of Latin Fathers who taught the 'and from the Son' and an equally impressive list of Greek Fathers who wrote of the Holy Spirit as proceeding 'through the Son' or either from the Father and 'flowing', 'bursting forth', 'issuing', etc. etc. 'through' or 'from' the Son, or 'from Both'. After the end of the public sessions Bessarion, George Scholarius, Isidore, Gregory, Dorotheus pressed the parallelism. They started from what was an axiom for the Greeks, for Mark as much as for any of the others — all saints are inspired by the same Holy Spirit and so teach the same truth even if in different words. Their conclusion was, the 'from' of the Latin saints means the same as the 'through' of the Greek. Mark should have been forced to the same conclusion. He accepted the axiom; he could not deny the testimonies from the Greek Fathers, because he was confronted with the codices that contained them; what he did, perforce, was to accuse the Latins of presenting garbled and deliberately falsified quotations from their own Latin Fathers, or at least quotations that could not be checked because he, Mark, with most of the Greeks knew no Latin. Not a few Latin treatises, however, especially those of that greatest advocate of the *Filioque*, St. Augustine, had long been translated into Greek, and there were, of course, some of the Greeks, like Scholarius, who knew Latin well and who tried to disabuse him. But he would not be disabused. The Latins were heretics, and that was that.

Mark's obstinacy would not have mattered so much if all the Greek prelates, or the most of them, had been of a high intellectual calibre. They were not. On a theological problem as intricate as that of the Blessed Trinity, they were fitted rather to follow another's judgment than to make their own. Mark's attitude was in line with Greek tradition. The greater part of the bishops were naturally inclined, sentimentally, to sympathise with it. They did, however, recognise by their votes the cogency of the arguments of Bessarion and the other Greek unionists, yet all the time Mark's rigid abstention was a permanent reproof that made them uneasy and left them with the feeling that they had betrayed the tradition of their Church. When to that was added the raucous condemnation of the monks and the mob of Constantinople after their return, they recanted one by one.

As Mark found himself more and more isolated in his hostility to union, he began to be afraid. In the past, those who did not submit themselves to the decision of an oecumenical council (and Mark recognised the gathering in Italy as oecumenical till he began to dis-

agree with it) had often been severely punished. Eugenius IV and the Latins, and not a few of the Greeks, felt that Mark should either conform to the general decision of the combined Church or at least be impeded from open opposition. Mark was still determined not to yield and so, to avoid the alternative, he appealed to the Emperor John who promised him a return unscathed to Constantinople. He was as good as his word. Eugenicus, who alone of the Greek prelates in Florence on 5 July 1439 did not sign the decree of union, travelled with the Emperor to Venice at the end of August and arrived safely in Constantinople on 1 February 1440 in the imperial ship.

This history of Mark Eugenicus' activity in Italy should explode once and for all the often repeated — far too often repeated, and that by people who should know better — myth that the Greeks enjoyed no liberty of speech in the Council of Florence, and signed the decree under compulsion. Mark did not sign. The rest need not have done so, if they had not wanted; and, if most of them had refused (the story is that most of them were forced to sign), there was nothing that the Emperor or anyone else could have done to make them. An isolated recalcitrant could more easily have been forced or eliminated. But the only recalcitrant in fact returned home with honor under imperial protection, completely unharmed. And he, the only obdurate and consistent adversary of union throughout the Council, was throughout the Council the speaker for the Greeks, approved of as such by he Emperor, who, it is said, was so set on union that he muzzled its opponents. At any time in Italy John VIII could have put Bessarion up to speak, or Isidore, instead of Eugenicus, for both of these were among the elected six orators, both were theologians enough to do honor to the Greek cause and both would have been more sympathetic to the cause of union. He did not do that. He left the intransigent Mark to speak without any official restraint during all the sessions, and, the sessions over, with equal liberty to express his opinion in the private meetings of the ecclesiastics. John VIII's letting Eugenicus go on opposing what he himself certainly wanted is not easy to explain, but it assuredly cannot be interpreted as denying freedom of speech to his subjects.

Back in Constantinople after the Council, Mark was more than ever the symbol of anti-unionism. When Metrophanes, a unionist, was made patriarch, Eugenicus assisted at none of the ceremonies, and, fearing that pressure might be brought to bear on him to mitigate his opposition, he left Constantinople secretly for his diocese of Ephesus, which he had not yet visited. The ' life ' written by his brother John portrays him as playing the part of the good shepherd there for some considerable time. Other sources suggest that the

Turkish authorities made difficulties and that he departed again soon after his arrival. Then there was the two years' confinement on Lemnos and his final return to Constantinople.

In all these various circumstances, he was active with voice and pen pursuading the hesitant, confirming the persuaded and exciting the convinced to open an undying opposition to union. It was not a very difficult task, because the Greeks at large had long believed that the Latins were heretics. But Mark performed his task well. He wrote an encyclical letter ' to all orthodox Christians everywhere and in the islands '; he composed an account of his action in the Council; he corresponded with various people. In the compositions he mingled deep reverence for tradition with scorn for the ' innovators ', ardent love of his Church and vulgar invective against the Latins and their Greek supporters (he never, however, wrote a disrespectful word about the Emperor), serious theological reasoning with the most blatant *argumenta ad hominem*. He was writing primarily, not for theologians, but for the mass of the Greeks, and he was clever enough to adapt his style and method to the educational level of the ignorant monks and the amorphous populace — very successfully. But his greatest triumph was that he finally persuaded George Scholarius, who for a time had stood aloof from the controversy, to take up his prophetic mantle after his death, and he could not have chosen a better successor for his purpose.

If some one cause is to be assigned for the failure of the Council of Florence, that cause was Mark Eugenicus, metropolitan of Ephesus. He enjoyed a well-deserved reputation for austerity of life and learning. He had the strength of character to follow a single-minded, indeed a narrowminded, purpose at any cost. To many of his fellow-countrymen he seemed the embodiment of all that was best in his Church. And he was proclaiming that the union was a betrayal of their faith, for by it the Latin doctrine of the Holy Spirit and the Latin rite in unleavened bread had been declared the equal of the Greek, whereas their Fathers and he knew that that was false.

Joseph Gill, S. J.

COMMENTS AND DOCUMENTS

Some Preparatory Documents of the Vatican Council

The following are four of the documents which were drawn up in connection with the Vatican Council. The first was directed to the Eastern Dissidents, Arcano Divinae Providentiae; *original Latin text to be found in the* Collectio Lacensis VII: Acta et Decreta sacrosanctae Oecumenici concilii Vaticani (*Friburgi Brisgoviae: Herder,* 1892) *Col.* 7-8. *The second was directed to all Protestants and other non-Catholics,* Iam vos omnes; *original Latin text* ibid. *Col.* 8-10. *The third and fourth documents have reference to the inquiry of an individual Protestant minister with regard to the general invitation made to non-Catholics; they are*: Per ephemeridies - ibid. *Col.* 1144-1145, *and* Cum in Litteris - ibid. *Col.* 1145-1146. *These documents will be of special interest to the readers of* Unitas *in connection with the declared aim of the coming Ecumenical Council relative to the reunion of Christendom.*

The English translation is drawn from contemporary issues of the London Tablet.

I

Arcano divinae Providentiae

To all Bishops of Churches of the Eastern Rites not in communion with the Apostolic See

Having been established by the secret designs of Divine Providence, without any merits of our own, in this lofty Chair, as heir of the most blessed Prince of the Apostles, who, according to the prerogative granted him by God, is the most firm and solid rock on which the Saviour built His Church, and urged by the solicitude of the burden which has been placed upon us, we most earnestly desire and endeavor to extend our care to all those in every region of the world who are called by the Christian name, and to draw all within the embraces of our paternal charity. For we cannot, without grave danger to our soul, neglect any part of that Christian

people which, having been redeemed by the most precious blood of Our Saviour, and brought by the sacred waters of baptism into Our Lord's flock, justly claims for itself all our vigilance. Therefore, since we should unintermittingly bestow all our care and thought on promoting the salvation of all who know and adore Christ Jesus, we turn our eyes and paternal mind to those Churches which were formerly united in the bond of unity with this Apostolic See, and flourished with so great renown of holiness and of heavenly doctrine, producing rich fruits for the glory of God and the salvation of souls. These Churches are now, to our extreme grief, through the wicked arts and machinations of him who in heaven excited the first schism, separated and divided from the communion of the Holy Roman Church which is spread throughout the world.

On this account, at the very beginning of our Supreme Pontificate, we spoke to you with full affection of heart words of peace and charity. And although these words did not obtain their most desired result, the hope has never left us that our humble and fervent prayers will be heard by the most merciful and most benign Author of salvation and peace, who wrought salvation in the midst of the earth, and who, the Orient on high, manifestly showed forth peace as pleasing to Him and to be accepted by all, announced it at His birth by the ministry of angels to men of good will, and while dwelling among men both taught it by word and preached it by example.

But at this time when, with the advice of our Venerable Brethren, the Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church, we have lately proclaimed and convoked an Ecumenical synod to be celebrated next year in Rome, and to begin on the eighth day of the month of December, which is sacred to the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, Mother of God, we again direct our voice to you; and with the greatest possible earnestness of soul we beseech, admonish, and pressingly exhort you to come to the said General Synod, as your ancestors came to the Second Council of Lyons held by our predecessor blessed Gregory X of venerable memory, and to the Council of Florence held by Eugenius IV of happy memory, also our predecessor; in order that the conditions of our former love may be renewed and the peace of our fathers (that heavenly and salutary gift of Christ which by lapse of time has withered) may be once more recalled to vigor, after the long-continued dissension, and so the light of desired union may shine brightly upon all.

And may this be the most happy fruit of benediction wherewith Christ Jesus, the Lord and Saviour of us all, may console His immaculate and most beloved spouse the Catholic Church, and dry

up and wipe away her tears in this bitter time: that all division being removed, voices hitherto at variance may, with perfect unity of spirit, join together in the praise of God, who desires not that schism may be among us, but has commanded by the voice of the Apostle that we should all speak and think alike. Thus may continual thanksgiving be ever offered up to the Father of Mercies by all His Saints, and especially by those most glorious ancient Fathers and Doctors of the Eastern Churches, when from heaven they look down on the restoration and renewal of that union with the Apostolic See, the centre of Catholic truth and unity, which they, whilst they lived upon earth, labored with every effort and with unwearied toil to cherish, and daily to forward more and more both by teaching and example — through the love which, diffused in their hearts by the Holy Ghost, they had for Him who broke down the wall of division, and who through His Blood reconciled all things and brought them into peace; who willed that the proof of being His disciples should consist in unity; and whose prayer went forth to His Father, « I pray that all may be one, as we are one ».

Given at Rome, at St. Peters, on the 8th day of September in the year 1868, the twenty-third year of our pontificate.

Pius PP. IX

II

Iam vos omnes

To Protestants and other Non-Catholics

You already know that we having been raised, notwithstanding our unworthiness, to this Chair of Peter, and therefore invested by Christ Our Lord with the supreme government and guardianship of the whole Catholic Church, have judged it reasonable to call unto us our Venerable Brethren the Bishops of the whole earth, and to unite them together for the celebration next year of an Ecumenical Council. We have done so in order that, in concert with these our Venerable Brethren who are called to share in our cares, we may take those steps which may be opportune and necessary, both for dispelling the darkness of the many noxious errors which, to the great loss of souls, everywhere and daily prevail, and for establishing and increasing daily more and more amongst the Christian people entrusted to our watchfulness, the kingdom of true Faith, Justice, and the Peace of God. Confidently relying on the close ties and most loving union, which, in so marked a way, unite ourselves and to this Holy See our Venerable Brethren, who,

through all the time of our Supreme Pontificate, have never failed to give to ourselves and this Holy See the clearest tokens of their love and veneration, we have a firm hope that this Ecumenical Council, summoned by us at this time, will produce, by the inspirations of Divine Grace, as other General Councils in the past ages have done, abundant fruits of benediction, to the greater glory of God and the eternal salvation of men.

Sustained by this hope, and roused and urged by the charity of our Lord Jesus Christ, Who gave His life for the whole human race, we cannot restrain ourselves, on the occasion of the future Council, from addressing our Apostolic and paternal words to all those who, whilst they know the same Jesus Christ as the Redeemer, and glory in the name of Christian, yet do not profess the true faith of Christ, nor hold to and follow the communion of the Catholic Church. And this we do in order to admonish, and conjure, and beseech them, with all the warmth of our zeal and in all charity, to consider and seriously examine whether they follow the path marked out for them by Jesus Christ Our Lord, which leads to eternal salvation. No one can deny or doubt that Jesus Christ Himself, in order to apply the fruits of His redemption to all generations of men, built His only Church in this world on Peter, that is to say, the Church, One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic; and that He gave him all the power necessary to preserve the deposit of Faith whole and inviolate, and to teach the same Faith to all kindreds, and peoples, and nations; so that all men might through baptism become members of His mystical Body; that the new life of grace, without which no one can ever attain to life eternal, might always in its own nature remain firm and immovable to the consummation of ages, that it might flourish, and supply to all its children all the means of salvation.

Now, whoever will carefully examine and reflect upon the condition of the various religious societies which are divided amongst themselves, and separated from the Catholic Church, which from the days of Our Lord Jesus Christ and His Apostles has ever exercised, by its lawful pastors, and still does exercise, the divine power committed to it by this same Lord, will easily satisfy himself that none of these societies, either singly or altogether, in any way form, or are, that one Catholic Church which Our Lord founded and built, and which He chose should be in the world; and that he cannot by any means say that these societies are members or parts of that Church, since they are visibly separated from Catholic unity.

For such-like societies, being destitute of that living authority established by God, which especially teaches men the things of

faith and the rule of morals, and which guides them in everything that relates to eternal life, are always varying in their doctrines, and this change and instability are increasing. Every one can easily understand, and clearly and evidently see, that this is distinctly opposite to the Church instituted by Our Lord Jesus Christ, in which truth must always continue firm and inaccessible to change, as a deposit given to the Church to be guarded in its integrity, and for the guardianship of which the presence and aid of the Holy Ghost have been promised to her forever. Everyone also knows that from these divergent doctrines and opinions, social schisms have had their birth, and that these again have generated sects and communions without number, which are continually spreading, to the great injury of Christian and civil society.

Indeed, whoever observes that religion is the foundation of human society, must perceive and acknowledge the great influence which this division of principles, this opposition, this strife of religious societies amongst themselves, must have on civil society; and with what force the denial of the authority established by God, for ruling the persuasions of the human mind and directing the actions of men as well in private as in social life, has fostered, spread, and supported those deplorable changes of times and circumstances, and those troubles which at this day overwhelm and afflict almost all nations.

Let all those, then, who do not profess the unity and truth of the Catholic Church avail themselves of the opportunity of this Council, in which the Catholic Church, to which their forefathers belonged, affords a new proof of her close unity and her invincible vitality; and let them satisfy the longings of their hearts, and liberate themselves from that state in which they cannot be assured of their own salvation. Let them unceasingly offer fervent prayers to the God of Mercy, that He will throw down the wall of separation, that He will scatter the darkness of error, and that He will lead them back to the bosom of our Holy Mother the Church, in whom their fathers found the salutary pastures of life, in whom alone the whole doctrine of Jesus Christ is preserved and handed down, and the mysteries of heavenly grace dispensed.

For ourself, to whom the same Christ our Lord has entrusted the charge of the supreme Apostolic ministry, and who must, therefore, fulfill with the greatest zeal all the functions of a good Pastor, and love with a paternal love and embrace in our charity all men wherever dispersed over the earth, we address this Letter to all Christians separated from us, and we again and again exhort and conjure them to return quickly to the one fold of Christ.

For we ardently desire their salvation in Jesus Christ; and

we fear to have one day to render account to Him Who is our Judge, if we do not show them and prepare for them, as far is in our power, the way to attain to eternal salvation. In all our prayers and supplications and thansksgiving, we cease not day nor night to ask earnestly and humbly for them, of the Eternal Pastor of souls, the abundance of light and heavenly grace. And since, notwithstanding our unworthiness, we hold the office of His Vicar upon earth, with outstretched hands we wait in the most ardent desire the return of our erring sons to the Catholic Church, so that we may receive them most lovingly into the House of our Heavenly Father, and may enrich them with His inexhaustible treasures. On this longed-for return to the truth and unity of the Catholic Church depends the salvation not only of individuals, but still more of the whole Christian society; and the whole world cannot enjoy true peace, unless there shall be one fold and one shepherd.

Given at St. Peters in Rome, the 13th day of September, 1868, in the 23rd year of our Pontificate.

Pius PP. IX

III

Per Ephemerides

To our Venerable Brother Henry Edward Manning Archbishop of Westminster

Venerable Brother, Health and the Apostolic Blessing. — We have seen from the newspapers that Dr. Cumming, of Scotland, has inquired of you whether leave will be given at the approaching Council to those who dissent from the Catholic Church, to put forward the arguments which they think can be advanced in support of their own opinions; and that on your replying that this is a matter to be determined by the Holy See, he has written to Us upon the subject.

Now, if the inquirer knows what is the belief of Catholics with respect to the teaching authority which has been given by our Divine Saviour to His Church, and therefore with respect to its infallibility in deciding questions which belong to dogma or to morals, he must know that the Church cannot permit errors which it has carefully considered, judged, and condemned, to be again brought under discussion. This, too, is what has already been made known by Our Letters. (Letter Apostolic of Sept. 13, 1868, addressed « to all Protestants and other non-Catholics »). For, when we said, « it cannot be denied or doubted that Jesus Christ Himself, in order that He might apply to all generations of men the fruits of His redemption,

built here on earth upon Peter His only Church, that is, the one, holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, and gave to him all power that was necessary for preserving whole and inviolate the deposit of faith, and for delivering the same faith to all peoples, and tribes, and nations », We thereby signified that the primacy both of honour and of jurisdiction, which was conferred upon Peter and his successors by the Founder of the Church, is placed beyond the hazard of disputation. This, indeed, is the hinge upon which the whole question between Catholics and all who dissent from them turns; and from this dissent, as from a fountain, all the errors of non-Catholics flow, « for, inasmuch as such bodies of men are destitute of that living and divinely established authority, which teaches mankind especially the things of faith and the rule of morals, and which also directs and governs them in whatever relates to eternal salvation, so these same bodies of men have ever varied in their teaching, and their change and instability never cease ». If, therefore, your inquirer will consider, either the opinion which is held by the Church as to the infallibility of its judgement in defining whatever belongs to faith or morals, or what We ourselves have written respecting the Primacy and teaching authority of Peter, he will at once perceive that no room can be given at the Council for the defence of errors which have already been condemned; and that we could not have invited non-Catholics to a discussion, but have only urged them « to avail themselves of the opportunity afforded by this Council in which the Catholic Church, to which their forefathers belonged, gives a new proof of its close unity and invincible vitality, and to satisfy the wants of their souls by withdrawing from a state in which they cannot be sure of their salvation ». If, by the inspiration of divine grace, they shall perceive their own danger, and shall seek God with their whole heart, they will easily cast away all preconceived and adverse opinions; and, laying aside all desire of disputation, they will return to the Father from whom they have long unhappily gone astray. We, on our part, will joyfully run to meet them; and embracing them with a father's charity, we shall rejoice, and the Church will rejoice with us, that our children who were dead have come to life again, and that they who were lost have been found. This indeed we earnestly ask of God; and do you, Venerable Brother, join your prayers to ours. In the meanwhile, as a token of the Divine favour, and of Our own special benevolence, We most lovingly give to you and to your diocese our Apostolic blessing.

Given at St. Peter's in Rome, this 4th day of September, 1869, in the 24th year of our Pontificate.

Pius PP. IX

IV

Cum in litteris

To our Venerable Brother, Henry Edward Manning, Archbishop of Westminster

Venerable Brother, Health and the Apostolic Blessing. — Having said in the letter which we addressed to you, Venerable Brother, on the fourth day of September last, that subjects which had already been carefully examined and decided by an Oecumenical Council could not again be called in question, that therefore no place could be given in the approaching Council for any defence of errors which had been condemned, and that for this reason we could not have invited non-Catholics to a discussion, we now learn that some of those who dissent from our faith have so understood those words to believe that no way is left open to them of making known the difficulties which keep them separated from the Catholic Church, and that almost all approach to us is cut off. But so far are we, the Vicar upon earth, although unworthily, of Him who came to save that which was lost, from repelling them in any way whatever, that we even go forth to meet them, and nothing do we seek for with a more ardent wish than to be able to stretch out our arms with a father's love to anyone who shall return to us. And never, certainly, have we wished to impose silence upon those who, misled by their education, and believing their opinions to be right, think their dissent from us rests upon strong arguments which they would wish to be examined by wise and prudent men. For although this cannot be done in the Council, there will not be wanting learned divines, appointed by ourselves, to whom they may open their minds, and may with confidence make known the reasons of their own belief; so that even out of the context of a discussion, undertaken solely with a desire of finding out the truth, they may receive a more abundant light to guide them to it. And may very many propose this to themselves, and carry it out in good faith! For it could not be done without great profit to themselves and to others; to themselves, indeed, because God will show His face to those that seek Him with their whole heart, and will give them what they long for; to others, because not only the example of eminent men cannot fail of its efficacy, but also the more diligently they shall have labored to obtain the benefit of truth the more earnestly will they strive to impart the same benefit to the rest. Earnestly praying the God of Mercy for this most happy issue, we desire you to receive, Venerable Brother, the Apostolic Blessing which, as a token of the

Divine favor and of our own especial good will, we most lovingly grant to you and to your whole diocese.

Given at St. Peter's, in Rome, on the 30th day of October, 1869, in the 24th year of our Pontificate.

PIUS PP. IX

* * *

THE FUTURE OF FAITH AND ORDER

Of all the activities that take place within the organizational life of the World Council of Churches, certainly that of the Department of Faith and Order has been followed with the most interest by ecumenically-minded Catholic theologians. This has been so by the very nature of things: on the one hand, because Catholics have constantly held that true Christian unity can only be had on a doctrinal basis; and on the other, because Faith and Order is primarily concerned with matters of theology.

In a recent issue of the Ecumenical Review (*April* 1959), *the future of Faith and Order is ably discussed by the executive secretary of the Department of Faith and Order, Dr. Keith R. Bridston. Passing in review the « Interim Report » presented by the Department at the meeting of the W.C.C. Central Committee at Nyborg Strand in July* 1958, *Dr. Bridston poses a number of searching questions relating to the task of Faith and Order in the ecumenical movement of our day. A relevant section of the article in question follows:*

But precisely because the World Council *is* taken with such seriousness, because its theological and ecclesiological implications *are* realized so clearly, the Faith and Order Committees raise some difficult questions in their Interim Report, not only about Faith and Order itself, but about the World Council, and about the whole nature of the ecumenical movement in our day.

The Report, therefore, is asking a two-sided question.

On the one hand, it is asking Faith and Order to re-examine its *raison d'être* in the light of the ecumenical change (which the World Council of Churches pre-eminently represents). It is asking Faith and Order to consider how its method and vision are relevant to this change: whether its method must be revised because of it, and to what extent its vision has been fulfilled by the change that has taken place. Is, for example, the method of « comparative ecclesiology » still adequate as a method? The Lund Conference of

1952 seemed to think not. Or, to take another example, is the vision of manifest unity adequately realized with the solemn covenant of the churches at the WCC Assembly at Amsterdam: « We intend to stay together? ». The Interim Report doubts it. Finally, what has this to say about the way Faith and Order should now « work »?

On the other hand, the Interim Report is asking the World Council some searching questions too. The first paragraph on « churchly unity » with its question: « *What kind of unity does God demand of His Church*? » affirms the « WCC can have no ' neutrality ' on whether that question is answered or not », and goes on to say « that if we do not find the right form of churchly unity we shall find ourselves remaining content with a form of organizational unity which is not a true churchly unity because it leaves unfulfilled many of the central requirements of the Church's life. ... Faith and Order must constantly press upon the Council and the churches the fact that the question of unity is one upon which an answer has to be given, and that to give no answer means to be shut up to the wrong answer ». The contrast between « churchly unity » and « various kinds of Christian co-operation » poses an awkward, but unavoidable, ecclesiological dilemma for the World Council — one which has already been given partial expression through the Toronto Statement of 1950. In it, the apparently contradictory positions are taken that « the Council exists to break the deadlock between the churches » but that « membership in the World Council does not imply the acceptance of a specific doctrine concerning the nature of church unity », and « therefore no church is obliged to change its ecclesiology as a consequence of membership in the World Council ».

The Interim Report is really calling attention to this theological paradox. Is this an ecclesiological dialectic inherent in the ecumenical movement itself? However it is interpreted, the paradox can, and will, become pure contradiction when it is not recognized, or when the paradoxical tension is relaxed by commitment to one of the dialectical poles to the exclusion of the other. For though « no church is obliged to change its ecclesiology », participation in a Council which « exists to break the deadlock between the churches » at least opens the possibility of changes in ecclesiologies, for without such changes the deadlocks cannot be broken.

If the World Council is only one of the « various kinds of Christian co-operation » the ecclesiological problem is not raised in this acute form. But just because Faith and Order has seen something more in the World Council than « co-operation » or « organizational unity », and because of its vision of manifest unity as an indispensable ecumenical goal, the Interim Report both welcomes the manifes-

tation of the *Una Sancta* which the World Council represents and challenges the World Council to « find the right form of churchly unity ».

Since the World Council has adopted the Faith and Order Constitution, and Faith and Order is a constituent part of the World Council, it is somewhat artificial to set one over against the other, or even to think in terms of one questioning the other. The image of Jonah and the whale is even less applicable than it once was! Nevertheless, it is evident that Faith and Order as a movement with its own history, traditions and particularly its peculiar vision of manifest church unity, is not easily « digested » into another institution — one which has a much more formal and ecclesiastical character than the ecumenical movements which preceded it.

How is one to combine movement with institution? The Interim Report tries to deal with this perplexing issue, and also in a somewhat two-sided way. On the Faith and Order side it envisages a program which continues the long-term study work of the Theological Commissions. This means not only study which « is fully sensitive to the real questions which the churches are asking », but also study which is involved by Faith and Order being the theological and ecclesiological « forum » of the World Council and therefore being able « to respond quickly to co-operation with other aspects of the WCC » and « be flexible to respond to such calls » for theological help as other Departments of the WCC may make upon it. The Report foresees Faith and Order's traditional programme being continued, but being broadened and enlarged by its new World Council context.

But beyond this the Report indicates other possible new intiatives. Three main ones are listed. The first is in regard to unity negotiations. Faith and Order has been extremely careful in the past not to give any impression of interfering in the internal affairs of the churches. At the same time, it has, according to its constitution, been willing to be used « as the handmaid of the churches in the preparatory work » towards reunion, and has provided an information service on union schemes and informally assisted in arranging consultations for those engaged in union negotiations. The Report suggests that one of the consequences of nearly fifty years of Faith and Order work « has been the creation of an atmosphere in which churches have been able to pass on from the discussion of unity in principle to negotiate concrete local unions » and that this may mean « in our day that part of the ' service ' of Faith and Order must be to take a far more active attitude towards the various plans for unity without itself, of course, ever being the sponsor of any specific

plan ». The « service » envisaged is providing for consultations for representatives engaged in union negotiations as an official part of the Faith and Order program, analyses of various schemes in current discussion, and « to render any assistance called for » in inter-church negotiations.

The second main initiative is to make regional meetings and other consultations, such as the New Zealand and Oberlin Conferences and the Lutheran-Reformed Consultation, a regular part of the Faith and Order programme, and to encourage Faith and Order departments in national Christian councils and councils of churches.

The third initiative is to put renewed emphasis on the traditional task of Faith and Order of drawing churches out of isolation into conference, with particular responsibility being taken toward those churches which have not yet joined the WCC. Two groups are especially in mind: the Roman Catholic Church, which has shown special interest in Faith and Order work, and Protestant churches outside the WCC.

In regard to the Roman Catholic Church, « Faith and Order is an aspect of the WCC in which the Roman Catholic Church has shown an interest. Roman Catholic theologians have made important contributions by their writings to the discussion of Faith and Order issues. We believe that this theological discussion should be pursued in whatever ways may be mutually acceptable ». The Report goes on to propose « that Faith and Order should (i) aim at a situation in the WCC staff which ensured that there should always be people sufficiently free from other commitments to make it a first charge on their time to be in continuous, personal and well-informed contact with the whole complexity of both these groups; (ii) on the basis of such contact, the Faith and Order secretariat, Working Committee, and other groups in Faith and Order would be in a position to be kept informed of developments and openings, and so able to seek their participation in our theological work where it was then deemed possible and advisable ». The recent pronouncement of Pope John XXIII on an ecumenical council on unity makes this especially relevant at the present time, and indeed, almost more than any other recent ecumenical event, has made clear the critical rôle which Faith and Order has in the life of the World Council.

* * *

A Hebrew Christian correspondent states his views on Missions to the Jews

The Church of *England Newspaper for* 24 *April carried two interesing articles which debated the merit of bringing the Gospel*

message to the Jews. The positive side of the argument was given by Rev. George H. Stevens, editorial secretary of the Anglican Church Missions to the Jews; while the negative was sustained by the Rev. Dr. James Parkes, another Anglican, who is historian of the Relations between the Jewish and the Non-Jewish World. The former argued that missions to the Jews are certainly justified because Christ's death on the Cross was necessary to achieve the salvation of all mankind. Dr. Parkes, instead, reflected the view recently expressed by Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr in an essay published in the Journal of the Central Conference of American Rabbis in which he termed as mistaken and useless Christian efforts to convert the Jews.

In the correspondence columns of a subsequent issue of the Church of England Newspaper *there appeared a noteworthy letter on the subject by J. H. Fieldsend of the London College of Divinity, who described himself as being a Hebrew Anglican ordinand. As a member of the Jewish race who embraced Christianity, the points made by Mr. Fieldsend are all the more telling. The text of his letter reads as follows:*

Sir, — As a Hebrew Christian ordinand I would like to pass a few comments on Dr. Parkes' letter of April 24; though I do this with some trepidation as I find his argument very difficult indeed to follow.

Dr. Parkes admits that Judaism is not an alternative scheme of salvation to Christianity. This, of course, is very true, but surely once this is conceded the necessity of the evangelisation of the Jews must be accepted, « for there is none other Name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved ». (Acts 4: 12).

In this connection Mr. Stevens in his article was not merely quoting a few isolated proof texts as Dr. Parkes suggests, but giving a few illustrations of the central theme of the New Testament of the 18th Article of Religion of our Church.

Again, Dr. Parkes says that good theology cannot be built on bad history, with which I heartly agree (without accepting the implication that Mr. Stevens is a bad historian) but it would surely not be amiss to point out that neither can good theology be built entirely on good history either; which, it seems, is what Dr. Parkes is trying to do. He apparently examines the impact of an imperfect Christianity on an imperfect Judaism and then tries to deduce from that whether missions to Jews are theologically valid or not.

There is one criterion, and one only, as to the rightness of these missions, and that is whether or not their existence is in the will of God, and the answer to that question will be found in Holy Scripture, not in the study of race relations.

In saying this, I am not trying to belittle the value of such

studies as an aid to our evangelistic effort. Neither can the moral rightness of a mission be judged by its apparent « success » or « failure », but only on its obedience to the command to preach the « Gospel of Christ » which is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth, to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile.

Dr. Parkes accuses Mr. Stevens of using clichés, but his own statement that Christianity meets man as an individual whereas Judaism meets man as a social being is both a cliché and an impossible over-simplification. Nor is it by any means true to say that Christianity is a different kind of religion to Judaism; rather it is the natural development and fulfillment of it in the light of the revelation of Jesus, our Messiah.

It is true to say that through the atoning work of Jesus Christ and through the gift of the Holy Spirit, Christianity meets man as a person in a sense which Judaism cannot, but I doubt whether the converse is true of Judaism if the fullness of the Christian heritage is realized.

Because the Church has behind it the Old Testament heritage of Judaism (or is this what Dr. Parkes calls bad history?) it should be at least as capable as Judaism is, to meet man as a social being, and with the New Testament doctrine of the Church as the body of Christ, the social nature of the Church should be even more prominent than that of Judaism. The weakness of Judaism, and indeed the weakness of all religions, except Christianity, is its inability to meet mean as an individual at the point of his deepest need. Man's deepest need, according to Jesus Christ, is that he must be « born again », not as a race, nor as nation, but as an individual.

I hope that the above will reassure many of our readers that the Christians' greatest treasure, the indwelling of the Lord Jesus Christ in our hearts, is most certainly equally valuable, and equally necessary to the Jew, as it is to him, and I trust that many will want to share that treasure.

J. H. Fieldsend.

* * *

Apropos of the Fourth Centenary of the Confession of La Rochelle.

In May the French Reformed celebrated the fourth centenary of the Confession of La Rochelle, which was the first profession of the Calvinist faith. It would have been difficult to turn the celebration into an ecumenical endeavor. In any case, the effort was made not to disturb that atmosphere of respect and comprehension to-

wards Catholics which so far has been one of the principal effects of ecumenism.

Yet one cannot at the same time both glorify and regret division. Thus, with respect to the addresses delivered on the occasion, we cannot but make one or the other observation.

One speaker, for example, presented the Reformation as an operation of a « great cleansing » (grand nettoyage); certainly, the word is not well chosen, and it would be just only if « to suppress » and « to cleanse» were always synonymus. It was likewise said that the Reformation had rediscovered the only really solid foundation; but the word « foundation » makes one think of the words of Jesus: « Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church ». It was further stated that the Reformers had never accepted division; yet it remains a fact that they brought it about.

May the proximity of an ecumenical council serve to remind us all that unity is willed by Christ, that the primary sollicitude of Christians should be to make it a reality; and that if it is possible in only one way, then it is in that one way that it must be realized. (The Editor).

* * *

ECUMENISM AND REUNION

Pope Calls on All Christians To Pray for Success of General Council

In a Vatican Radio message of April 27, His Holiness Pope John XXIII appealed to the Christian world for a compaign of prayers to the Blessed Virgin Mary during the novena before Pentecost for the success of the announced ecumenical council. The address was directed primarily to the bishops of the world, but the appeal was also made to all Christians.

The Catholic faithful were asked by His Holiness to go to church each day during May to pray and recite the Rosary. Families who could not go to church were asked to pray together in their homes; children and the sick, whose prayers were called the most acceptable, were likewise encouraged to pray for the intention.

The message was one of the most impassioned to date by the Pope to mobilize the Christian world for the council, scheduled to be held in about two years, and increasingly thought to be one of the most important events of modern Christian history. The Pope reminded the faithful of the Church's experience in always finding Mary's help in times of trial, especially when « the threat of impending disaster everywhere increases ». He declared his lack of confidence in human resources alone to bring about success for the council, and solemnly stated his trust in the prayers of the faithful to Mary. He appealed to Christendom to storm heaven with « an almost unanimous voice », saying that those who wish the Church well could do no less. The Pope concluded by referring to the first Pentecost when Mary awaited with the Apostles in the Cenacle the coming of the Holy Spirit upon the Church, and said that « the intentions of the Church and the difficulties that trouble her are also those of the Mother of God in the greatest degree ».

On Pentecost Day itself Pope John assisted at solemn pontifical vespers in St. Peter's Basilica and on this occasion delivered an allocution to those in attendance. Making reference to the coming council, he said in part: « Towards the end of January, on the feast of the Conversion of St. Paul, We announced the project for the celebration of a *Concilium oecumenicum* which like a new Pentecost would bring together, above all, all the bishops of the

Church having communion with the Apostolic See. This is an assembly calling for an immense and profound preparation and calculated, with the help of the Lord, to the great sanctification of the clergy, the edification of the Christian people, and an encouraging manifestation to those who have thoughts of faith and of peace. Here we are, then, on this very day of Pentecost, May 17, 1959, with the first act of this extraordinary undertaking, namely, the announcement of the Preparatory Commission for this great event. It is a first introduction, that is, the beginning of a series of acts and of constitutions which involve the preparation of research and of study, in which all the languages of the world will be able to express themselves. It is quite natural that for all this long months of extensive elaboration will be necessary. We shall have further occasion to return to this theme, designed to move heaven and earth ... ». (*C. Cattolica*).

* * *

Pope Names Preparatory Commission for Ecumenical Council

On the eve of Pentecost, the *Osservatore Romano,* announced the papal appointment of a preparatory commission of twelve members, under the presidency of Cardinal Domenico Tardini, in view of the forthcoming general council. The members of the commission are: Monsignor Giuseppe Ferretto, assessor to the Consistorial Congregation; Father Acace Coussa, assessor to the Congregation for the Eastern Church; Msgr. Cesare Zerba, secretary to the Congregation of the Sacraments; Msgr. Pietro Palazzini, secretary to the Congregation of the Council; Fr. Arcade Larraona, secretary to the Congregation of Religious; Msgr. Pietro Sigismondi, secretary to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith; Msgr. Enrico Dante, pro-secretary to the Congregation of Rites; Msgr. Antonio Samore, secretary for Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs; Msgr. Dino Staffa, secretary to the Congregation of Seminaries and Universities; Father Paul Philippe, O. P., commissioner to the Congregation of the Holy Office; and Msgr. Pericle Felici, auditor of the Holy Roman Rota.

The task of the commission will be to make contact with Catholic bishops throughout the world for opportune advice and suggestions; to assemble the various proposals of the different offices of the Roman *curia;* to map out the general lines of the subjects to be treated in the Council after taking into consideration the opinions of theologians and canon lawyers; and to make suggestions regarding the different preparatory commissions and secretariates necessary for the work of the council.

* * *

Pope John Views Christian Unity as a Gradual Process

In a letter to priests of the Venice area gathered in pilgrimage before the remains of Pope St. Pius X in the Basilica of St. Mark, Pope John expressed his hope for a « first step closer, then a step still closer, and finally the perfect reunion of so many separated brethren with the ancient common Mother, the Church of Rome ».

The Holy Father indicated that he is mapping the path to unity for the Christians of the East in particular, and announced that he is placing the ecumenical council under the patronage of St. Pius X. In the letter, he held up three lessons from the life of the Saint for the imitation of all priests: dignity, love of the Church, and wisdom. The Pope expressed the hope that in the Church of the West, the council will lead to the « generous pastoral collaboration of the two clergies (diocesan and that of religious communities) under the watchfulness and direction of the Bishop who is shepherd of all the sheep ». (*NC*).

* * *

Ecumenical Patriarch Affirms Good Relations with Rome and Gives Stand on Coming Council

Archbishop Giacomo Testa, who is the Pope's successor as Apostolic Delegate to Turkey, was received late in April « with great gladness and cordiality » by the Ecumenical Patriarch Athenagoras, according to a spokesman for the latter after the meeting.

The same spokesman declared further that relations between the Patriarchate of Constantinople and Rome were good. Indications of this could be seen from the fact that the Patriarch was represented at the requiem Mass for the late Pope Pius XII and also at the reception at the Apostolic Delegation following the election and coronation of Pope John XXIII.

In the course of the meeting between the Patriarch Athenagoras and Archbishop Testa, the former revealed that the Orthodox Church will take part in the coming Ecumenical Council only if all Christians are invited to send representatives. In this connection, Archbishop Testa quoted the Orthodox leader as saying: « No synod can be called ecumenical unless it is truly such, that is, pan-Christian. If the Orthodox Church is invited, it will be represented only if the entire Christian world is invited to send representatives. The minimum representation of the other churches would

be their collective representation through the World Council of Churches ».

Commenting on the meeting of these two church leaders, and on the Pope's reception in audience of the new Orthodox Archbishop of America, the Greek newspaper *Kathimerini* remarks that these visits « constitute two manifestations which prepare the ground and create the climate for a *rapprochement* between the Orthodox and Catholic Churches, a *rapprochement* that is necessary if one day the union of the Churches is to be constructively envisaged ». (*C. Herald*).

* * *

Former President of Lutheran World Federation Comments on Forthcoming Council

In a recent issue of his diocesan journal, Lutheran Bishop Hans Lilje of Hanover and former president of the Lutheran World Federation, comments at length on Pope John XXIII's decision to summon an ecumenical council.

Dr. Lilje notes, first of all, that of all the gestures of the new Pope his annoucement of a coming general council is the one to which the greatest publicity has been given throughout the world. In this connection the German churchman dismisses the allegation that this step was intended to be a spectacular move, and remarks rather that « trained observers of Vatican policy see in this project one of most decisive steps forward of the Pope ».

The Lutheran leader sees in this papal decision the beginning of a new trend towards a betterment of relations between Rome and non-Catholic Christians. « Naturally », Dr. Lilje explains, « it is unthinkable that a Council will bring into question the dogmatic foundations of the Catholic Church; but it could show in various ways that what is wanted is a different relationship, and a more living one, with other Christian Churches, and that practical means exist for bringing this about ».

Stress is placed by the Bishop on the interest that His Holiness, John XXIII has shown towards the Orthodox Churches and notes that the Pope will meet with comprehension on the part of the patriarchs.

But will there in fact be an invitation addressed to the Orthodox Churches? Dr. Lilje envisions two obstacles in this respect. One is of a dogmatic nature and touches upon the authority exercised by the Pope over the Council. The second is of a political nature and perhaps even more difficult to overcome. A considerable

part of the Orthodox Churches find themselves in countries under Communist control. Accordingly, these Churches could very well be impeded from attending the Council; but they will see themselves obliged to find theological reasons as a motive for their refusal. It is conceivable that then a rift could be brought about between the Orthodox Churches on the occasion of a Council summoned in part to bring about Christian unity.

The World Council of Churches, Dr. Lilje continues, maintains an enlightened reserve. The declarations it has made so far show that in spite of all the difficulties involved, the World Council « does not wish to enclose itself within an entirely negative attitude, as long as there exists the slightest hope of any progress whatsoever towards the collaboration of Churches. And even if the (coming) Council were to achieve nothing essential with respect to the quest for unity among the Churches, it could prove to be very useful in other domains ».

« One thing is certain », concludes Dr. Lilje, « and that is that whatever furthers the genuine unity of Christian Churches will also further the peace of the world » (*La Croix*).

* * *

World Council Presidents Issue Message for Pentecost

Continuing a practice followed over the last number of years the presidents of the World Council of Churches again issued a message for Pentecost Sunday to the 171 Protestant, Anglican, and Orthodox Churches in 53 countries which constitute members of the Council. The message is signed by its five presidents: Dr. John Baillie, Church of Scotland; Bishop Sante Uberto Barbieri, Methodist, Buenos Aires; Bishop Otto Dibelius, Lutheran Bishop of Berlin and Brandenburg; Metropolitan Juhanon Mar Thoma, head of the Mar Thoma Syrian Church, Tiruvalla, India; and the Rt. Reverend Henry Knox Sherrill, recently retired bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, U.S.A. The text of the message follows:

> Whitsunday is the festival of the Holy Spirit and the festival of the Church. For these two belong together. St. Paul states that relationship in these words: « For by one Spirit we were all baptised into one body, Jews or Greek, slaves and free... » (I Cor. 12: 13).
>
> The Holy Spirit has created the Church. The Holy Spirit is the life of the Church today. As we pray that the Holy Spirit may come into our own lives, we pray at the same time that we may become living members of the one Body of Christ.

The Holy Spirit is the Spirit of unity, which is constantly at work to heal the divisions which obscure the wonderful truth of the oneness of Christ's Body and which gathers all the baptised together into the one family of God.

The Holy Spirit is the Spirit of renewal, which overcomes the dimness of our vision, the routine of our piety, our easy acceptance of the ways of the world and gives new life to the congregations and their members who open their hearts and minds for the gifts of the Spirit.

The Holy Spirit is the Spirit of witness and mission which urges us to cease being preoccupied with ourselves and sends us out into the world with its crying spiritual and material needs in order to proclaim by word and deed that humanity is surrounded by the love of God in Christ.

The Holy Spirit is the Spirit of reconciliation which overcomes misunderstanding and estrangement among the churches and enables them to become a force for peace between nations and races.

Let us therefore rejoice in the presence of God's Holy Spirit. Let us witness anew to His all-transforming power. Let us glorify God and enjoy the fruits of His Spirit Who has come to lead us to greater fullness of life, this day and evermore. (*EPS*)

* * *

Catholics Obliged To Work For Reunion Of Separatists, Theologian Asserts

A leading French theologian, Father P. A. Liege, O. P., in his new book, *The Mystery of the Church,* published by the Fides Publishers Association in Chicago, declares that Catholics are obliged to work for the reunion of the separated churches with the Catholic Church « with all their strength in a great spirit of truth and charity ». The author goes on to say that « a true disciple of Christ cannot resign himself to the existence of these divisions. Even if he is certain of being in the true fold of Christ, he suffers because he has separated brothers, and he labors for reunion, as the Catholic Church has always done in her prayers and in her action ».

« God alone knows the hour and the means of the reunion of the separated churches to the Church », he writes. But this fact, he continues, does not lessen the obligation of Catholics to work

for reunion. « They will gladly recognize every element of positive Christianity in their separated brethren », he asserts, « while pointing out that the Church possesses the plenitude of the Christian values to which they legitimately hold fast. And Catholics will do all this without liberalism, but also without the Pharisaism of those who think they have been constituted judges over their brothers, simply because God has designed to allow His truth to dwell in them. It can happen that a dissident Christian may be truer than his Church, and that a Catholic may be less true than his Church ».

Father Liege points out that historically almost all Catholic efforts for reunion in the face of « two great dissidences » of Orthodoxy and of the Protestant Reformation have been based on a « rigorous apologetics ». He explains that this is the argument that « the Catholic Church, in spite of the human insufficiencies of her ministers and with all her dogmatic exigencies, remains the only Church of Christ ». While the argument is valid, he says, it « presents only one aspect of the truth, and then in an over-simplified way ». « Actually, a great many dissidents are not themselves abettors of dissidence », he continues. « In their secession, they have kept a part of the Christian capital, and this capital continues to bear among them. Thus the Church of Christ invisibly embraces them within her frontiers. They are not totally outside. It is, therefore, more exact to consider the dissidents in good faith as imperfect members of the Catholic Church and to present the return to unity to them as the fulfiillment of their charity in the visible community of the 'catholica', as a fuller participation in the life-giving influence of Christ ». (NC)

* * *

Editor Sees Co-operation between Catholics and Protestants Growing in the U. S.

Fr. Thurston N. Davis, the editor of *America,* the Jesuit national weekly magazine, has declared that the co-operation between Roman Catholics and Protestants in the United States is one of the most significant trends in American church life.

Father Davis, who was speaking in Chicago, said that « today there is a much greater readiness among both Catholics and Protestants to work together toward clearly defined civic and social goals. People of both groups are joining forces as Christians and men of good will to attack problems of race, housing, juvenile delinquency, city planning and adult education ». He made clear, however, that « part of that understanding is that the faiths are fundamentally

different — Protestant is Protestant and Catholic is Catholic. They are not going to merge into some kind of bland and harmless mixture ». (*EPS*)

* * *

Catholic and Russian-Orthodox Relations Discussed by Fordham Jesuit Father

Speaking at Davenport, Iowa in April, Fr. Austin Mohrbacher, S. J., of the Russian Center at Fordham University, stressed the point of corporate reunion with the Russian Orthodox Church, and said that « nothing is further from the truth than to say we are going in to ' Christianize ' Russia ». He stated that, although the priests belonging to the Center at Fordham all wish to go to Russia, they recognize that the Russian Orthodox would be the leaders in bringing the Christian message to the people there.

The Russian Orthodox are just as anxious for reunion as are Catholics, he went on to say, but the Orthodox, « being realists, know there are real difficulties ». He stated that from the Russian Orthodox point of view, Catholics must go back and ' reconsider ' all the dogmas of papal infallibility and the Immaculate Conception. « As Catholics, of course », the priest declared, « we cannot do that. One does not reconsider something that he believes with all his heart and soul. So you have a real impasse... The Catholic viewpoint is that these are not real problems because there is nothing new in the Church since the time of the death of the last Apostle, and, therefore, infallibility, though perhaps not as clear then as it is now, was always present ».

Fr. Mohrbacher indicated that the apprehension of the Russian Orthodox is that the Pope would be a « dictator » and that they would lose their customs and practices by reuniting with Rome. But he added that Pope John has « won their hearts with his openness and friendliness ».

As part of their program at the Russian Center, Father Mohrbacher and his fellow-priests have become proficient in the Russian language, have been ordained in the Byzantine Rite and offer the Divine Liturgy in that rite only. (*NC*)

* * *

Catholics and Calvinists Unite in Prayer for Peace

On the first Sunday of May, a joint pastoral letter was read in all the churches of the Netherlands —both Catholic and Prot-

estant — urging all Christians to pray for the success of the conference of Foreign Ministers at Geneva.

Following a reference to the annual commemoration of those killed during the last war, the pastoral went on to say: « But in these days we are again oppressed by fear of war between nations. We shudder at the thought of nuclear energy as a means of power in the hands of governments and the consequent responsibility of authorities towards humanity ».

« In the near future », concluded the letter, « state leaders are setting themselves to a supreme effort in order to realize by joint consultations a community in which nations serve each other in a world in which conflicts seem to grow larger as distances grow smaller... The Churches of the Netherlands call, therefore, jointly on all whose minds are preoccupied with the distress of the world to pray for the co-operation between nations that is so greatly needed. The Churches, though conscious of their divisions, will nevertheless cling to the unity they have in Christ. From this they derive the courage to call for repentance and prayer in this divided world ».

(*C. Herald*)

* * *

Anglican Bishop Makes Strong Plea for Historic Episcopate

Speaking at an anniversary service in St. Bride's Church, London, the Anglican Bishop of Chelmsford, Dr. Faulkner Allison strongly defended the insistence of his communion on the necessity of the episcopate in the life of the Church.

« The fact that the historic episcopate, as we understand it », declared Dr. Allison, « did not become fully and finally established in the life of the whole Church at the very outset of its history should no more disturb us than the fact that the Canon of Holy Scripture did not become fully and finally established until the fifth century ».

To regard the historic episcopate as « an obstacle erected by human intransigence in the path of the wind of the spirit », an attitude taken by some in the non-episcopal Churches, betrayed, said the Bishop, « a false and limited view of the operation of the Spirit of God in the life of the Church ».

« The fact that the three-fold ministry of bishop, priest (or presbyter) and deacon was recognized as the norm of Church order throughout the whole of Christendom until the time of the Reformation, and is still the norm for over three-quarters of Christendom, surely provides a cogent argument for believing that the historic

episcopate and an episcopally ordained ministry if not of the essence of the Church, have been shown to be part of God's plan for the fullness of the Church's life.

« I find it difficult, indeed impossible », continued Dr. Allison, « to believe that the same Spirit who guided the Church into this particular form of Church order can now be seeking, for the sake of that unity which we know to be the Spirit's will for the Church, to persuade the Church, or at any rate great parts of the Church, to set it on one side.

« The Spirit may indeed be seeking, and I believe is seeking, to lead the Church into a new and wider understanding of God's plan for the exercise of the *episcopé* in the life of His Church.

« I cannot, however, believe, in the light of Church history, that the Spirit is now seeking to lead us to regard as of secondary importance what we in the Anglican Communion, in common with the greater part of Christendom, believe to be a precious element in that Catholic heritage which we owe to the guiding influence of the Spirit of God, whose gift of freedom must always be seen within the context of His gift of order ». (*C. E. Newpaper*)

* * *

Lutherans and Church of South India Move Toward Union

The Lutheran Churches in South India and the Church of South India have been advised by a joint theological commission from both bodies that « the degree of doctrinal agreement between us is such as to warrant a closer fellowship than now exists between our Churches ». The Churches have been urged to seek closer fellowship in practice.

The recommendations were the result of a meeting of the Joint Commission at Bangalore in mid-April ,which removed Lutheran hesitations about the place of the « historic episcopate » in the Church of South India, a union of former Anglicans, Congregationalists, Methodists and Presbyterians.

The preparation of a catechism to be used in the Church of South India and Lutheran Churches, organization of regional conferences to discuss controversial points about the Church and the ministry, and the drawing up of a Constitution and Doctrinal Statement based on the work already done by the Joint Theological Commission, were the specific recommendations looking toward union.

The Joint Commission affirms that « the exercise of oversight (*episcope*) was early entrusted by the Church to one bishop in each

area. This ordering was for many centuries universal and is still the accepted form among the majority of Christians. We do not hold that it is essential for the existence of the Church, or for the ministry and the sacraments, or that God has bound Himself to grant through it greater blessing, authority or grace than through other forms of the Church's ministry. It has been and can be grievously misused, as can every gift of God. But we see a value in it as expressing through a person oversight which is a vital part of the pastoral ministry within the Church. However, the presence or absence of episcopacy ought not by itself to determine the relationship of one church with another ».

The Church of South India has over one million adherents. The Federation of Evangelical Lutheran Churches in India represents ten churches with about 653,300 members. (*EPS*)

* * *

Church of Scotland Assembly Votes against « Bishops in Presbytery » Plan

Following a recommendation of the Inter-Church Relations Committee of the Church of Scotland that the proposal for acceptance of « Bishops-in-Presbytery » should be rejected, the General Assembly of that Church in late May voted 300 to 266 against the plan. The proposal had been sponsored by a commission of Anglican and Presbyterian representatives from England and Scotland as a step towards the unification of the Church of England, the Church of Scotland, the Presbyterian Church in England, and the Episcopal Church in Scotland. It advocated recognition of bishops by Presbyterians and the adoption of Presbyterian elements in church government by Anglicans. Previous to the adverse vote in the General Assembly, thirty-nine of sixty-two Church of Scotland presbyteries which had studied the proposal rejected it; the others have indicated that they are of the same mind.

As its chief reason for the negative vote, the General Assembly stated that « the proposals in the joint report are unacceptable in that they imply a denial of the catholicity of the Church of Scotland and of the validity and regularity of its ministry within the Church Catholic ».

The convenor of the Assembly's Inter-Church Relations Committee, Dr. A. C. Craig, a leading figure in ecumenical circles, resigned after the voting. Expressing his disappointment in the outcome, he accused the Church of Scotland of having made a switch in policy. (*EPS*)

AROUND THE WORLD

ROME

Pope John Receives Greek King and Queen in State Audience

An event of particular significance occurred in late May when King Paul and Queen Frederika of Greece were received in state audience by His Holiness, Pope John XXIII. It marked the first time since the fifteenth century that Pope and Greek ruler had met. It will be recalled that the last such meeting took place in 1439 at the time of the Council of Florence when the Byzantine Emperor, John VIII Palaeologus, part of whose domains included Greece, was received by Pope Eugene IV.

In a formal address in French which he delivered to his royal visitors, Pope John praised the contributions which Greece has made to civilization and to Christianity. Recalling his sojourn at Athens as representative of the late Pius XII, he extolled the « strength of character of your people, its energy, its resistance, its religious spirit... and its courtesy ». The Holy Father likewise assured King Paul and Queen Frederika of his lasting sympathy for their nation. In conclusion the Pope spoke briefly in modern Greek to express his satisfaction at their visit.

Since diplomatic relations do not exist between Orthodox Greece and the Holy See, the visit of the Greek sovereigns was not a matter of ordinary protocol. (The last Vatican representative to live in Greece was the present Pope who left Athens for a new post in Paris in 1944). Further, while it is known that the Greek people are grateful for the relief services which the then Msgr. Roncalli rendered them during the late war, the visit of their King and Queen is looked as something considerably more than a simple gesture of gratitude. It is thought, rather, that the personality of the Holy Father together with his announcement of the convocation of a general council has brought about a change in the atmosphere which at times has been rather strained over the last number of years.

(*La Croix*)

Constitutions for Roman Synod Being Prepared in Draft Form

A central commission and eight sub-commissions are now preparing the draft of the constitutions that will form the platform for the Roman Synod summoned by Pope John XXIII for the end of this year. The constitutions will be proposed by the commissions, and the members of the Synod, after due deliberation, will ratify them and put them into effect for Rome.

For the present, the commissions are made up of forty ecclesiastics, eleven of whom are parish priests of Rome. Others will be added to their number as the work of preparation progresses.

The sub-commissions are dealing with the following points: the rights and duties of the clergy and laity; religious instruction and the communications media; divine worship and the liturgy; pastoral administration of the sacraments and vocations; apostolic action; education of youth; ecclesiastical property and new churches; and charity and relief.

The importance of the constitutions arises from the fact that the Pope has specified that their provisions should serve as a model for imitation in dioceses throught the world. (*NC*).

Inscriptions Strengthen Tradition of Site of St. Peter's Tomb

A three-volume work entitled *The Graffiti under the* (*Altar of the*) *Confession of St Peter's in the Vatican* by archaeologist Margherita Guarducci was recently presented to the Holy Father at a private audience. In the course of the work the author concludes from evidence supplied from excavations under St. Peter's Basilica that some time around the year 100 a Christian cult connected with the tomb of St. Peter was already in existence in Rome.

The work of excavation on this site has been in progress for a good number of years. Through the combined efforts of architects, engineers, and archaeologists, the earth beneath the basilica has been carefully removed, gradually bringing to light a pre-Christian burial ground in which has also been found the site of the tomb of the first head of the Church. The remains of what is definitely known to have been the tomb of St. Peter were found directly beneath the main altar of the present basilica. Near this tomb are inscriptions, *graffiti* — markings with sticks of graphite — and other scratchings on ancient plaster walls that give evidence of the devotion of early Christians in this place.

There are many traces of « mystical cryptography » which provides a key to the meaning of certain secret symbols apparently used by the then outlawed Christians. Through this code many of the inscriptions were deciphered to reveal important information about St. Peter and the early Church. The name of St. Peter appears on the walls several times and in general is linked with the name of Christ, reflecting the intimate union between the two which Scripture and tradition ascribe to them. Some inscriptions also attest to the fact that the tomb of St. Peter is nearby, giving further weight to the proofs which identify the actual site of the burial of the Prince of the Apostles. (*NC*)

* * *

THE UNITED STATES

Passing of J. Foster Dulles Recalls His Interest in the World Council of Churches

The passing from the world scene of the late John Foster Dulles, former American Secretary of State, was justly lamented through out the world. A sincere Christian, he was both an intrepid champion of human dignity and freedom and an advocate of international cooperation and fellowship. It was this conviction that led him to be associated with the World Council of Churches at its very inception at Amsterdam in August, 1948.

Mr. Dulles at that time was one of the principal speakers to appear before the Assembly. It is interesting to recall here the concluding words of the address he then delivered:

« As we thus analyze the world situation », said the late Mr. Dulles, « Christian responsability emerges as an inescapable fact. The moral principles that need to be put to work are implicit in all the great religions. But Christians believe that moral truth was uniquely revealed by Jesus Christ. Also, Christianity emphasizes not merely the relations of man to God, but also the relations of man to man. So the Christian churches should feel a special responsability. If they do not discharge it, political leadership can scarcely hope to succeed.

« That is a conclusion that ought to lead to practical consequences. The Christian influence is considerable but as yet wholly inadequate. If, in the international field, Christians are to play their clearly indicated part, the churches must have better organization. They should be able to speak more impressively with greater unity. They should be able to act with greater coordination. They should

put more emphasis on Christianity as a world religion, remembering that God gave His Son because He loved the World, not merely the West.

« It is for such reasons, I take it, that we are here. We are not here merely for a single inspiring experience. Rather, we are here to create a world organization that will go on working daily to mobilize Christian power to break down the walls of division. Thus we shall serve Him who was lifted up that He might draw all men unto Him ».

Recent Catholic Statistics

According to figures given in the *American Catholic Directory for 1959* published by P. J. Kennedy & Sons of New York, there are 37,285,975 Catholics in the 48 continental states and 219,500 in Alaska and Hawaii. This represents an increase of 3,481,498 over last year, a total which includes approximately 2,000,000 reported for the first time by the Military Ordinariate as the number of Catholics in the armed forces. The number of converts to the Catholic Church in 1958 was given as 140,411.

The *Directory* reveals that there are 52,689 priests, both diocesan and religious, in the United States, while Sisters number 164,922. Increases are reported in every department of the Church's activity among Americans, one of the most notable being the field of education: a total of 8,549,019 students are enrolled in the various Catholic educational institutions of the land; this shows an increase of 789,642, or 10,3 per cent over comparable figures for the preceding year. (*B. Pilot*).

* * *

GERMANY

First Bishop for Ukrainian Catholics in Germany

His Holiness Pope John XXIII has recently set up an apostolic exarchy for the Catholic Ukrainians of Germany. He has named as their first bishop (exarch) Fr. Platon Kornyljakij, until recently the chancellor of the Ukrainian archdiocese of Philadelphia (USA).

This step is a further manifestation of the remarkable growth of the Catholic Church of the Ukrainian Rite in recent years. In 1956 an archdiocese and three dioceses of this rite were created in Canada, while 1958 saw the erection of an archdiocese and a diocese in the United States, and an exarchy in Australia. In the lat-

ter year, as well, a bishop of the Ukrainian Rite was made auxiliary to Cardinal de Barros Camara in Rio de Janeiro. (*SICO*).

* * *

FRANCE

Centenary of Birth of Henry Bergson Observed

For their Tenth Congress this year the *Sociétés de philosophie de langue francaise* dedicated their session to the memory of the outstanding French philosopher, Henri Bergson, who was born in Paris on October 18, 1859. The theme of the Congress was « Bergson et nous », simple words which indicate that the ideas of Bergson are still very much alive at the present time.

The large numbers of students who attended the sessions in the spacious amphitheatre of the Sorbonne were reminiscent of the numerous auditors who were attracted to the lectures given there by the late philosopher in his prime. While the room assigned to him at the Sorbonne had places for only 375 persons, more than 700 would regularly assist at his classes.

Simultaneous with the Congress, which was attended by many foreign visitors, an impressive exposition in honor of Bergson was inaugurated at the Bibliothèque nationale where various valuable documents relating to his life and work were assembled. Among these was to be found the last will of Bergson, one passage of which reads:

« My reflections have brought me closer and closer to Catholicism, in which I see the real fulfillment of Judaism. I would have been converted to it had I not perceived developing over the years the formidable wave of anti-semitism which is going to sweep over the world. I have preferred to remain among those who will be the persecuted of tomorrow. But I hope that some Catholic priest will be willing, if the Cardinal Archbishop of Paris grants him the authorization, to say some prayers at my funeral ».

At the moment of the German invasion of 1940, Bergson left Saint-Cyr-sur-Loire for Dax, and later returned to Paris in November. He died there on the third of January, 1941, and three days later was interred at Garches.

In 1925 he had written: « When one has spent his life in looking for the truth, he realizes that he would have spent it better in doing good » (*La Croix*).

* * *

SCOTLAND

Episcopalian Churchman Comments on Reformation Centenary

Speaking in Old St. Paul's Church in Edinburgh on Pentecost Sunday, the Reverend Douglas Lockhart expressed his view that the fourth centenary of the Reformation in Scotland was not an occasion in which his fellow Episcopalians could rejoice with their Presbyterian countrymen. He termed it an event for which one could not be thankful since with the Reformation the Christian religion came to an end in the form in which it had been known in Scotland for more than eleven hundred years. Mr. Lockhart said that John Knox had overthrown the existing Church order and had brought into being a new religion with no idea of maintaining a continuity with traditional Christianity.

« So ensued », continued the speaker, « all the religious miseries, and many of the secular ones which plagued the country in succeeding centuries ... the fanatical bigotry, and two centuries of artistic, literary, and musical bankruptcy as the Renaissance by-passed us ».

Pointing out that the 400 years since the Reformation had been particularly characterized in Scotland by disunity, Mr. Lockhart concluded: « Let us commemorate the ' Reformation ' in Scotland with penitence and not with satisfaction, with acts of reparation and not of thanksgiving ». (*L. Tablet*).

* * *

DENMARK

Danish Lutheran Parish Restores Kyrie And Gloria To Communion Service

Two prayers of the first part of the Mass — the Kyrie Eleison and the Greater Doxology, or Gloria — have been reestablished in the Communion Service at the Lutheran Church of Our Lady in Copenhagen. Permission for the use of these prayers was given by Bishop Hans Fulgsand-Damgaard, head of the Lutheran Church in Denmark. Lutheranism is the State religion of Denmark.

Although neither the Kyrie nor Gloria was ever outlawed from the Danish Lutheran liturgy, their use, however, was gradually abandoned. Their restoration is seen as part of a general trend toward

a more Catholic form of worship among Danish Lutherans. Denmark's Protestant liturgical revival has already brought about the creation of a liturgical commission which is presently engaged in revising traditional church services.

Dr. Paul Brodersen, Lutheran dean in Copenhagen, commenting on the restoration of the Kyrie and Gloria, said: « I am of the opinion that these two parts of the liturgy form both a really beautiful and proper introduction to the (Communion) service ». (NC).

* * *

GREECE

Orthodox Missionary Enterprise Being Formed

A pan-Orthodox missionary society is now in the process of formation under the auspices of *Syndesmos,* an international organization of Orthodox youth. This step reflects a certain importance since it marks the first organized missionary activity of any extent to be undertaken by the Orthodox in modern times.

The point of departure for this undertaking was the fourth General Assembly of *Syndesmos* at Thessalonika in September 1958 when an Executive Committee for Orthodox Missions was created with temporary headquarters at Athens. The Assembly launched an appeal to Orthodox youth to take seriously the missionary duty of all the faithful and gave as the goal of its missionary endeavor: « the study of the missionary work of the Orthodox from the historical point of view; the formation of public opinion on this subject, and particular solicitude for the Orthodox Churches of Korea, Japan, and Uganda ».

The first bulletin of the new organization explains in detail the missionary tasks of the Orthodox Church and stresses that these follow from « a clear and definite order of our Lord ». The leading article of the new publication, signed by Professor Anastasios Yannoulatos, a lay theologian and member of the Executive Committee, refutes the objections to the initiative and after having traced in broad lines the missionary activities of the Orthodox in the past, he writes: « A defensive policy such as ours is today does not permit us to make extensive conquests. If we permit ourselves to continue in our habitual inertia towards all that regards foreign missions, not only are we putting our light under a bushel, but we are also betraying one of the essential elements of the Orthodox tradition ». (*Le Miss. Cattoliche*).

* * *

CHINA

Further Confirmation of Government Restrictions on Christian Bodies

Indirect reports reaching the West from China indicate that government pressure there is affecting all Christian groups among the Chinese. Efforts to create a schismatic Catholic Church among the latter is already a matter of public knowledge, and recently news relating to non-Catholic bodies in China reveals that Protestants, too, are having their difficulties.

It its most recent number, the *Friends of Reunion Bulletin*, of Cornwall, England, published a statement issued by the Standing Committee of the Conference of Missionary Societies in Great Britain and Ireland which deals with this subject and which reads in part:

« News has been released recently which indicates that there have been critical developments in the situation affecting the Churches in China. There has been a compulsory unification of the main Protestant denominations, the number of local congregations has been drastically reduced, and Church property thus no longer used has been handed over to the Government. It is said that the normal pattern is for cities with a population of some 500.000 people to have one church only. Reports state that out of the sixty-five churches in Peking only four remain, and of Shanghai's two hundred churches the number remaining open for united services has been variously reported as between twelve and twenty-three.

« There is some confirmation in this country of this news. To it can be added that ministers and salaried church workers have undergone long periods of politicial training, and are expected to seek secular employment.

« It seems right that this information should be given publicity, if only that prayer on behalf of the Churches in China may be offered with awareness of their actual situation ... ».

While the statement, brief as it is, makes evident the serious nature of the situation for Christians in China, it goes on to warn that too little is known of the events there to make a completely correct appraisal of the facts.

* * *

TIBET

Tibetan Rebellion Attributed to Communist Anti-religious Interference

The Dalai Lama, Tibetan spiritual and temporal leader regarded by his Buddhist followers as the reincarnation of a deity, blames the rebellion in his country on Red China's « interference » with religious freedom. The DalayLama recently issued a statement to-this effect in his own name at Tezpur, India, where he has taken sanctuary. He declared that the Chinese interference led to a conflict which took on « serious proportions in 1956, and that in the consequent struggle, the Chinese armed forces destroyed a large number of monasteries. Many lamas were killed, and a large number of monks and officials were taken and employed on the construction of roads in China; and as the interference in the exercise of religious freedom increased, the relation of Tibetans with China became openly strained from the early part of February, 1959 ».

The Tibetan leader categorically denied the Chinese Communist statement that he had been « kidnapped » by « rebel bandits », but said that he came to India from Tibet of his « own free will and not under duress » (*NC*).

BOOK REVIEWS

P. Grigoriou, *Relations Between Catholics and Orthodox* (in Greek), (Athens, 1958), 697 pages.

The capture of Constantinople by the Turks in 1453 marked the end of the union of the Churches achieved fourteen years before in Florence. It altered, also, the status of the Greek Church, which, instead now of being almost synonymous with the Byzantine power, was a foreign institution within a Turkish State. It still had much freedom and no little authority, but it was dependent, dependent upon the whim of the Sultan and, as the years went by, upon the intrigues of many Turkish officials. By the end of the XVI century (which marks the beginning of the period treated of in this book), the Patriarch was the civil, as well as the ecclesiastical, head of the Orthodox enclave within the Mohammedan State. The Catholics, fewer far in numbers, looked on the French ambassador at the *Porte* as their representative. The Protestants, mainly Dutch and English, were all foreigners, diplomats or merchants, but active often in promoting Protestantism.

In this book Fr. Grigoriou sets out to record the history of relations between the Catholics and the Orthodox. The first part of the volume takes the Aegean and the Ionian islands and various places of the mainland one by one, and, largely by quotations from contemporary documents, depicts the generally friendly atmosphere that obtained. Jesuits and Capuchins preached and gave missions to mixed congregations. Some churches had altars of both rites and were used, at least on certain feasts, by priests of both rites. Orthodox took part in Catholic processions on Corpus Christi. Orthodox prelates and priests invited Catholic missionaries to minister to their flocks and gave them 'faculties' for it. The story is almost monotonous because it was the same everywhere; nonetheless it is astonishing. And more could have been added of exploits of Catholics elsewhere ministering to their own faithful and to Orthodox indiscriminately. Books, particularly St. Robert Bellarmine's Catechism, were printed in Rome in the Greek language and in Greek letters, or more often in the Greek language but in Latin letters (why, it is hard to say), for the instruction of

the faithful. Why did all this stop and when, for stop it did. Fr. Grigoriou is less detailed when he comes to answer this question. The authorities on both sides had not always been happy about this *communicatio in sacris*. It is noteworthy, too, that the letters quoted by the Author are always of Jesuits and Capuchins, though other Orders also were working in those parts.

Parts two and three are mutually supplementary and, in a sense, in reverse order, for Part two treats of *efforts toward Union* from both the Catholic and the Orthodox side in the last century or so, while Part three traces in its great lines the history of the schism — Cerularius, Photius, the estrangement of the two Churches — and of the great endeavors to heal it —the Council of Lyons and of Florence. Here the Author has, naturally, nothing new to add to the usually accepted accounts: he has taken his narrative from them.

The fourth Part contains two chapters. The one, *Why the Division Persists,* is chiefly a warning to Orthodox Christians of the risk they run of damage to their faith by too close contact with Protestants. The other, *The Problem of Union, Its present State,* is an explanation and defence of those points of Latin teaching that most offend the Orthodox, that they are true, inevitable, and not so bad as they are made out to be by non-Catholics. Orthodox and Catholics are agreed in looking upon union as desirable, both because of Christ's foundation of one Church and because of the need to close the Christian ranks to face paganism. Why not, then, unite? The Church is wise and gentle in its treatment of uniting bodies. They keep their liturgy, language, traditions and gain the solidity that comes from the rock of Peter.

Fr. Grigoriou's book is very long, far too long, and has many digressions which he himself calls digressions without disguising them. If, in consequence, it is not going to find many readers who will go through it steadily from beginning to end, it should find very many who will use it for reference, for it has in it a great wealth of information. It is particularly rich in quotations. The account of the amicable relations of the first Part is very largely in the form of extracts from letters. The story of Catholic and Orthodox endeavours of these latter years towards unity, and even the last chapter on the *Problem of Union,* are told to a great extent in quotations, quotations from Catholics and from Orthodox, of earlier days and of recent years and, indeed, of contemporaries.

A vast amount of work over many years must have preceded the writing of this book. The quotations in the text, the references in the footnotes and the very long bibliography (though the Author cannot possibly have read all the writings noted there) are proof

of that. May it help to the attainment of what he had ever at heart when he was writing — the union of the two sister Churches.

J. Gill, S. J.

Rev. Raffaele De Simone, *Gli Anni decisivi di Storia Valdese: Missioni, repressioni e tolleranza nelle valli Piemontesi dal 1559 al 1561* (*Analecta Gregoriana*, vol. XCVII). Rome, 1958, pp. 330.

We have felt it best to present this book to our readers by reproducing the preface written for it by the president of the Unitas Association, the Rev. Charles Boyer, S. J.

The author of the present volume, Fr. Raphael De Simone, professor of Church History at the Regional Seminary of Molfetta, Italy, has wished that his work be prefaced by a few introductory words by the president of an association dedicated to the promotion of Christian unity, of which he himself is an active member, in order the better to bring into relief the intention of his research which is to study within a particularly significant period the problem of the relations between Catholics and non-Catholics in Italy. The importance of such a study is evident. The truth is that non-Catholics in Italy have always been a very small minority; however, it is to be kept in mind that Italian religious affairs which are under the direct and immediate control of the Roman Pontificate, assume definite significance which history cannot underestimate.

The only Protestant group in Italy which has a centuries-old history is the Waldensian Church. Faithful to the message of Peter Waldo of Lyons, a dissident community established itself at the beginning of the thirteenth century in the valleys to the west of Turin and succeeded in maintaining a characteristic cultural and religious physiognomy until the early part of 1500. In contact with German and Swiss Protestants, the Waldensians of Piedmont accepted their doctrines en bloc towards 1530. Bossuet, after having recounted this fact in his *Histoire des Variations*, concludes: « Ainsi finirent les Vaudois ». In fact, he sees them subsequently, i. e., in the period studied by Fr. De Simone, only as Calvinists. But the name « Waldensians » has remained in use.

The Catholic Restoration thus found itself confronted by the serious problem created by the presence of thousands of Protestants on the western confines of Italy. How was the problem resolved? To this question the author has deigned to give us the answer.

The Waldensian question was faced directly by the Duke of Savoy, Emmanuel Filibert (to whom were politically subject the

greater part of the Waldenses of Piedmont) in the three years from 1559 to 1561. The history of these three decisive years makes up the matter of this dissertation, presented as a doctoral thesis to the faculty of Church History of the Pontifical Gregorian University.

The author has not contented himself with bringing together and evaluating that which has up to now been published regarding this argument, but by diligent research has brought to light numerous unedited documents, many of them unknown, in the Vatican Archives, in the archives of the Jesuit, Dominican, and Augustinian centers, and in the Piedmont archives and libraries. With this abundant material and with a sense of rigorous historical objectivity, Father De Simone has been able to reconstruct for us three phases of the period under consideration.

In the first phase there prevails the hope of being able to convert the Waldensians, principally by the missionary method of persuasion. Here the most important episodes are the conversation of Ciabas between Possevino and Lentolo (July 26, 1560) and the abjuration of Vercelli (January 6, 1561).

The second phase is characterized by a repressive activity, already resorted to in an effective manner in 1560. Recourse is had to this on a wide scale from February to April 1561. The Waldensians defend themselves tenaciously and succeed in placing the ducal army in serious difficulty.

There appears, finally, in the third phase the idea of tolerance. On June 5, 1561, Filibert, influenced by serious reasons of political order and by his affection for his wife, Margaret of Valois (who had favored the Waldensian cause by a kind of Erasmian irenicism), concedes to the Waldensians the possibility of exercising their public worship in determined localities. Here we find ourselves before the first example of juridical tolerance towards dissenters granted by a Catholic sovereign, certainly prior to the first edicts touching on this matter decreed in France in 1562 and in Poland in 1573.

The work concludes with an evaluation of the effects of this tolerance towards the Waldenses up to our own day. In this section of the book we see the important connection of Waldensian history with the various ideological and pragmatic phases of the relations between Catholics and Protestants in sixteenth-century Europe. With the experiences of that century serving as a background, the author attempts to bring into relief those factors which in our day could serve the apostolate for unity, without prejudice, however, to serene historical veracity.

Through the course of this book — the description of repressive measures notwithstanding — there appears the constant desire

of the Church of Rome to bring back to her side her distant children; one seems to hear echoing across the centuries the phrase of St. Augustine: « *Ecclesia clamat ut revertantur et inserantur* ».

Rev. Charles Boyer, S. J.

Gustave Weigel, S. J., *Faith And Understanding In America*, New York, The Macmillan Company, 1959, 170 pp.

Father Weigel, a well-known spokesman of American Catholicism and a professor of Ecclesiology at Woodstock College in Maryland, endeavors in this collection of essays to increase the self-knowledge of both Catholics and Protestants as well as their knowledge and understanding of one another Treating most complex phenomena, as, for instance, the « Catholic Conception of Religious Truth », « Protestant Theological Positions Today », and « Ecumenism and the Catholic », it is obvious that his approach in this small book must be journalistic, — through illuminating examples and observations, — and not scientific. This, however, does not mean that such a « bird's-eye view of contemporaneous Catholic and Protestant theologies » cannot also be useful to the theologian. One of the tendencies of the present-day situation is, according to Father Weigel, that lay people become more and more inclined to compel « anyone who has studied divinity to answer every type of question ». Some of these questions are treated in his book, and the embarassment of the theologian might greatly be reduced if he were to assimilate Father Weigel's friendly approach.

What is of particular interest for the present review is the author's treatment of Catholic ecumenism. Analyzing American Catholicism, he makes the following observation: « The American Catholic takes religious pluralism as an obvious fact. He is not disedified or scandalized by it. His own love of religion makes him prefer to have his neighbor in some church rather than in no church at all. The general effect is that the American Catholic is much more tolerant of non-Catholic religions than members of European communities where only one religion is effectively present. This tolerance may be interpreted by some superficial observers as a diminished allegiance to Catholicism, though such an interpretation would be very wide of the mark. Catholic tolerance is caused by an exercise of charity rather than by a defect of faith » (p. 75).

In the chapter on « Ecumenism and the Catholic », Father Weigel explains why « neither Catholic nor Protestant could want the Catholic Church as a member of the World Council of Churches », in spite of the great positive interest among Catholics

for ecumenical work, as demonstrated through the many Catholic associations and magazines dedicated to Church unity. The World Council has to be viewed as just one *particular* expression of the desire for unity — an expression limited by its historical and ideological context, that on the one hand makes it an expression of Protestant self-defence against disintegration, a « Protestantism, Inc. », and on the other hand an expression of the peculiar Protestant ecclesiology, according to which the « Churches » are nothing more than a combination of the individual Christian's practical interests and his spiritual well-being. When a Church does not function according to its first century pattern, this means to the Protestant that a lack of sanctity in its members is revealed. A confession of the « sins » of the Churches, as the one made at the Evanston Assembly, is against this background perfectly understandable. The Protestants consider themselves above the Church and are thereby its judges. Is should, however, be equally understandable that the Catholic Church by becoming a member of such a Protestant organization as the World Council would renounce its own faith and become Protestant itself.

Typical of Father Weigel's approach is the following question: « Have the ecumenists ever thought of the hypothesis of the presence of the Catholic Church in the World Council with a voting power proportionate to her numbers? The Catholic Church would then outvote all the others, and they would be obliged to leave their own Council! ».

Father Weigel's stand against participation in the World Council in no way means that he despairs about the possibility of ecumenical work. Much fruitful work may be done through smaller unofficial meetings, like that sponsored by the Una Sancta in Germany. It must be « the act of a private group united by the Christian desire for the total union of all Christians ... For neither side is there any inconsistency, and on both sides charity is highly visible ... Formal organization is not necessary for such work ... The lack of formality would not mean total irresponsibility, for the Catholics would have to work with the cognizance of their bishop ... The smallness of the groups implies no disadvantage, for in small groups there comes a more intimate acquaintance with the group members, which would be an aid to charity that thrives on understanding. Besides, many small groups widely spread over the world can be more efficient in the production of reunion than one large association with headquarters far away even for those who live in its shadow. We must go to the grassroots, for the nearer the ecumenical movement comes to the soil of the commonalty of believers the greater are its prospects

of achieving its high goal ... This is certainly possible. What is more, it is urgent, for we must come together lest many a soul, cut off from a strong Christian unity, grow slack and listless and thus become a ready prey to naturalism or worse ».

Father Weigel does not only outline a program. Some of his essays, like the one, « Protestant Theological Positions Today », would be ideal texts for discussion in the informal ecumenical meetings that he envisages.

EDVARD VOGT